



*Library of the Theological Seminary,*  
PRINCETON, N. J.

BX 5198 .H7 1865 v.9  
Hook, Walter Farquhar, 1798-  
1875.

*Shelf.....*

Lives of the archbishops of  
Canterbury







L I V E S  
OF THE  
ARCHBISHOPS OF CANTERBURY.

VOL. IV. NEW SERIES.

Reformation Period.



LONDON : PRINTED BY  
SPOTTISWOODE AND CO., NEW-STREET SQUARE  
AND PARLIAMENT STREET

L I V E S  
OF THE  
ARCHBISHOPS OF CANTERBURY.

BY  
WALTER FARQUHAR HOOK, D.D. F.R.S.  
DEAN OF CHICHESTER.

VOL. IV. NEW SERIES.  
REFORMATION PERIOD.

History which may be called just and perfect history is of three kinds, according to the object which it propoundeth or pretendeth to represent; for it either representeth a time, or a person, or an action. The first we call Chronicles, the second Lives, and the third Narratives or Relations. Of these, although Chronicles be the most complete and absolute kind of history, and hath most estimation and glory, yet Lives excelleth in profit and use, and Narratives or Relations in verity or sincerity. LORD BACON.



LONDON:  
RICHARD BENTLEY & SON, NEW BURLINGTON STREET,  
Publishers in Ordinary to Her Majesty.  
1872.





L I V E S  
OF THE  
ARCHBISHOPS OF CANTERBURY.

VOL. IX.

Reformation Period.

LONDON: PRINTED BY  
SPOTTISWOODE AND CO., NEW-STREET SQUARE  
AND PARLIAMENT STREET

# LIVES

OF THE

## ARCHBISHOPS OF CANTERBURY.

BY  
WALTER FARQUHAR ✓ HOOK, D.D. F.R.S.  
DEAN OF CHICHESTER.

VOLUME IX.  
REFORMATION PERIOD.

History which may be called just and perfect history is of three kinds, according to the object which it propoundeth or pretendeth to represent; for it either representeth a time, or a person, or an action. The first we call Chronicles, the second Lives, and the third Narratives or Relations. Of these, although Chronicles be the most complete and absolute kind of history, and hath most estimation and glory, yet Lives excelleth in profit and use, and Narratives or Relations in verity or sincerity. LORD BACON.



LONDON:  
RICHARD BENTLEY & SON, NEW BURLINGTON STREET,  
Publishers in Ordinary to Her Majesty.  
1872.







## ADVERTISEMENT.

---

AN APOLOGY is due to the public for the delay in the publication of this Volume. It would be an impertinence on the part of an author to appeal to the sympathy of his readers, the great majority of whom must be strangers to him; but it will be easily understood, how impossible it was to engage in a work, which, to be rendered in any respect worthy of the reader's notice, required the undivided attention of the writer and the exercise of all his intellectual powers, during months of intense domestic anxiety, concluded by an affliction so stunning in its effect as to paralyse, for a time, the powers of the mind.

A portion of this Volume having been written nearly twelve months before the latter portion of it was resumed, some repetitions may have occurred for which the reader's indulgence is asked.

At the suggestion of some friendly reviewers, and at the request of many of his readers, the Author has divided the Biography of Parker into several Chapters ; and has desired to assist the student by the addition of side notes, referring to the statements made in the context and occasionally supplying for his guidance a reference to dates.



# CONTENTS

OF

## THE NINTH VOLUME.

---

### BOOK IV.—*continued.*

#### CHAPTER V.

##### MATTHEW PARKER.

The Parker family.—Nicolas Parker, the founder.—William Parker.—His marriage with Alice Menins.—Birth of Matthew Parker.—His early education.—Death of his father.—Enters at Cambridge.—State of the University.—Date of Parker's matriculation.—Takes his degree.—Master of his college.—Revenue of the college.—Foundation of the library.—Elected vice-chancellor.—Controversy with Bishop Gardiner.—Interview with Henry VIII.—Visitation of Cambridge in 1549 . . . . . page 1

#### CHAPTER VI.

##### PARKER AS A STUDENT AND DIVINE.

Parker's early opinions.—Lutheranism at Cambridge.—Thomas Bilney.—The Anabaptists.—Dr. Barnes and the White House.—Martin Bucer.—Parker preaches his funeral sermon.—Scholasticism and the Schoolmen.—Parker's patristic studies.—The four great councils.—The English reformers.—Catholics and Protestants 32

## CHAPTER VII.

## PARKER AS A PASTOR AND PREACHER.

Parker returns to Norwich.—Is licensed to preach.—Becomes chaplain to Anne Boleyn, and Dean of Stoke.—Appointed chaplain to Henry VIII.—The deanery of Stoke.—Reforms of 1536-43.—Statute of six articles.—Presented to the living of Ashen.—Prebendary of Ely.—Rector of Burlingham.—Of Landbeach.—Is accused of heresy.—Dr. Stokes.—Dissolution of Stoke.—Parker is appointed Dean of Lincoln.—Marries Margaret Harleston.—Reforms of 1547 and 1549.—Summoned to preach at Paul's Cross.—Disturbances of 1549.—Rising in the West.—Kett's insurrection.—Parker during the reign of Mary.—His accident.—View of his character . . . . . page 64

## CHAPTER VIII.

## FROM THE DEATH OF MARY TO THE ELECTION OF PARKER.

Position of Parker on the accession of Elizabeth.—The great parties in the country.—The Reformers.—The Exiles.—Anabaptists and Lollards.—Papists.—Condition of the clergy.—Character of Elizabeth.—Policy of the government.—Conduct of the pope.—Coronation of Elizabeth.—Parker summoned to London.—Liturgical Reforms.—Act of Uniformity.—Act of Supremacy.—Spoliation Act.—Westminster Conference.—Diocesans summoned before the Privy Council.—Reception of the Prayer Book.—The regular clergy advocates of the papal supremacy.—The secular clergy in favour of the Reformation.—Apostolical Succession.—Primacy offered to Parker.—Refused.—Offered to Dr. Wotton.—Offered to Feckenham.—Parker nominated Primate.—His letter to the queen.—His election.—Commissions for his confirmation.—Difference between valid and legal consecration.—Number of officiating bishops to make a consecration legal.—Parker's confirmation.—Letter of the emperor to the queen.—Petition of the Puritans.—Court of High Commission.—Preparations for Parker's consecration.—William Barlow chosen to preside.—His history.—Co-operating bishops.—The consecration.—Appendix . . . . . 120

## CHAPTER IX.

## PROCEEDINGS IMMEDIATELY AFTER PARKER'S CONSECRATION.

Parker's position as primate.—Archbishop Heath's letter of remonstrance.—Parker's reply.—Treatment of the non-juring bishops.—Change of policy at Rome.—Death of Paul IV.—Pius IV. and Queen Elizabeth.—Invitation to the Council of Trent.—Elizabeth an avowed Catholic.—Consecration of bishops.—Correspondence with John Calvin.—Rules for ordination.—Lay help.—Disagreement among the bishops.—Fire at St. Paul's.—The episcopal assessors.—John Jewel.—His sermon at Paul's Cross.—Apology for the Church of England.—Sketch of the condition of the English Church . . . page 255

## CHAPTER X.

## PREPARATIONS FOR CONVOCATION.

Authority of a Metropolitan.—Powers of Convocation.—Prohibited degrees of marriage.—Lax notion among Protestants on the subject of marriage.—Latin version of the Prayer Book.—Office in behalf of benefactors.—Communion office at funerals.—Re-introduction of the Catholic Calendar, and its reformation.—The Lectionary.—Second Book of Homilies.—The Great Bible.—The Geneva Bible.—Bishops' Bible.—Parker's selection of translators.—Thirty-nine Articles.—Articles as much opposed to ultra-Protestantism as to Popery . . . . . 292

## CHAPTER XI.

## PARKER IN CONVOCATION.

Programme for the opening of Convocation drawn up by the archbishop.—Meeting of Convocation on 12th of January.—Sermon preached by the Provost of Eton.—Dean Nowell prolocutor.—Defaulters pronounced contumacious.—Meetings at the Chapter House of St. Paul's and in Henry VII.'s Chapel.—Revolutionary measures of the minority.—Bishop Sandys.—Alterations proposed in the Prayer Book.—Minority of thirty-three.—Dissenting tactics.—Church saved by Anglo-Catholics.—Prolocutor accepted by the primate.—Thirty-nine Articles accepted by the Northern Convocation as well as by that of Canterbury.—Clause in the 20th Article.—Nowell's Catechisms.—Cecil

and Parker opposed to Sectarianism.—Catechism formally received, but not adopted by the Synod.—Freedom of speech encouraged.—Legislation prevented.—Unsatisfactory state of the Temporalities.—Dissolution of Convocation.—Parker's description of the members.—Lenient policy.—Clerical apparel.—Marriage with a deceased wife's sister.—Convocation of 1571.—Subscription to the Articles.—Catholicism of the English Church.—Ancient Catholic canons still the law of the Church of England.—Convocation of 1572.—Archbishop's speech . . . . . page 340

## CHAPTER XII.

### CONTROVERSIES.

Party government.—Vestment controversy.—The principle of Elizabeth's government.—Reformation of an old Church, not the establishment of a Protestant sect.—Elizabeth's ecclesiastical policy.—Two-thirds of clergy and laity were Anglo-Catholics.—Concessions made on both sides.—Bishop Gheast's letter on the Eucharist.—Diversities of practice.—Bad taste of the Puritans.—Persecution of Parker.—His life threatened.—Mandate of the queen to the primate and his suffragans to enforce uniformity.—Vacillation of the queen.—Earl of Leicester; his evil influence with the queen.—A profligate man, though the leader of the Puritans.—Parker's employment of the press.—Foreign theologians consulted.—Parker's misunderstanding with the queen.—Change of opinion in Jewel and others.—The attack nominally on vestments, in reality on Episcopacy.—Puritans discovered Anti-Christ in the Church of England.—Royal Commission.—Controversy with Sampson and Humphrys.—Parker's generosity to his opponents.—Disturbances in London churches.—Eucharist profaned.—Clergy in surplices mobbed.—Insults offered to the archbishop's chaplains.—Forms observed in celebrating.—London clergy cited before the Ecclesiastical Commissioners.—Addressed by the Chancellor.—Licences for preaching revoked and renewed.—Papal privileges asserted at Cambridge.—Parker's success.—Character of the English Reformation.—Peter Heylin, Wolfgang Musculus.—Establishment of Anglo-Romanism in opposition to Anglo-Catholicism.—Excommunication of Elizabeth by the pope.—Establishment of Protestant Dissent.—Thomas Cartwright.—Opposition to Episcopacy.—All Church principles denied seriatim.—Romish dissent not formally established before the time of Cardinal Wiseman.—Puritan schism established at Wandsworth.—Troubles

towards the close of Parker's life.—Parliament of 1571.—Bitter feeling of the Puritan members against the bishops and the Church.—Violence of Strickland.—Peter Wentworth.—Precisians.—Brownists.—Prophesyings.—Earl of Sussex.—Visitation of the Isle of Wight.—Parker insulted at Court.—His angry letter . . . page 366

## CHAPTER XIII.

## VISITATIONS.

Parker's care not to increase the expenses of the inferior clergy.—Determined to hold a metropolitical visitation.—Opposed by his Suffragans.—The returned Exiles preferred.—Their avarice.—Visitation of Canterbury by Commission.—Anglo-Catholics and Puritans.—Inquiry into the state of churches.—Irregularity of the inquiries.—Irregularities brought to light.—Incestuous marriages.—Diocesan visitations.—Parker declined procurations.—Parker appeared in great state, but paid all expenses from his private purse.—His residence at Bekesbourne.—Scarcity of food.—Fast appointed by the archbishop.—Form of prayer drawn up by Grindal.—Corrected by Parker.—Visitation of Hospitals and Schools.—Visitation of Sandwich.—The archiepiscopal peculiars.—State of Canterbury Cathedral.—Regulations for preachers.—Complaints of irregularity in the local dioceses.—Articles of inquiry in the diocese of Norwich.—Visitation of the Metropolitan Cathedral.—Efficacy of Prayer.—Quarrel with Lord Keeper Bacon.—Visits his own diocese in person.—Confirmations and Statutes given to Cathedrals of the new foundation.—Concealers.—Consecrations.—Dispute between the Dean and one of the Canons.—Hospitals visited.—Appointment of a Suffragan Bishop of Dover.—Visits the Universities.—Royal Commission.—Disturbances at Cambridge.—Condition of Bene't College.—Winchester, Eton, and Westminster visited.—Alarm at the report of the Parisian Massacre on St. Bartholomew's Day.—Seminarists in England . . . 420

## CHAPTER XIV.

## JUDICIAL PROCEEDINGS.

Inns of Court.—Difficulties besetting a judge.—Ecclesiastical Commission.—Tendency of Puritanism to democracy.—Dr. Yale.—Parker's defence of Yale's appointment.—Court of Faculties.—Papal encroachments.—Archbishop's authority to supersede papal dispensations.—



Reform of Court impeded.—Court of Faculties an offensive Court.—Parker accused of partiality by Leicester.—Reformation of the Court of Faculties.—Case of Bigamy.—Singular case.—Case of Lady Katharine Grey.—Judgment given against her, and the Earl of Hertford, who claimed to be her husband.—Their imprisonment.—Lady Katharine's apartments in the Tower.—Lady Katharine committed to the custody of her uncle, Lord John Grey, when the plague was in London.—Her death.—Parker censured.—Lady Mary Grey.—Case of George Googe.—Cecil's interference.—Parker's conduct vindicated.—Reform of the Court of Arches.—Dr. Clarke.—Bornelius page 458

## CHAPTER XV.

### PARKER'S LITERARY PURSUITS.

Version of the Psalms.—On celibacy of the clergy.—Excerpta from Martin's book.—Parker obtains an order of the Privy Council to borrow books.—Number of books collected.—Matthias Flacius, surnamed Illyricus.—Elfric's Anglo-Saxon Homily.—Gildas.—John Josceline.—Bale, the precursor of the Master of the Rolls.—The Chronicles.—Flores Historiarum.—Matthew Paris.—Walsingham's *Historia Anglicana* and *Hypodigma Neustriæ*.—Asser's *Life of Alfred*.—Parker as an editor.—*De Antiquitate Britannicæ Ecclesiæ*.—Parker's bequest to Corpus Christi College, Cambridge.—List of his works . . . . . 486

## CHAPTER XVI.

### PRIVATE AND DOMESTIC LIFE.

The lordly state of bishops defended.—Addition to Parker's coat-of-arms.—The motto assumed by Parker attests his humility.—Parker's seal.—Sustained the "port" of a bishop.—His household, order, attendance.—Definition of duties to the members of his family.—Paid high wages.—Surprising that he should be accused of penuriousness.—Accused to Cecil both of extravagance and penuriousness.—Sir John Parker's description of the revenues of the see.—Cheque Roll.—Benefactions to his University and College.—Dilapidated state of the property.—Repairs at Lambeth and at Canterbury.—Parker's care of the accounts.—Repairs at Bokesbourne.—Increases the endowment of the Bokesbourne living.—Rebuilds his house at Bokesbourne.—Revenues from Ford.—Opposition of the courtiers.—Lambeth Manor

House converted into the Palace of the see of Canterbury.—Splendour of Parker's entertainments.—Robbery of the episcopal estates.—The three festivals at Canterbury.—The archbishop continued to entertain ambassadors, and to act as jailer to state prisoners.—Tunstall, Boxall, Thirlby, Lord Henry Howard, Lord Stourton.—Schedule of state prisoners.—French ambassador entertained by Parker.—Mrs. Parker's private apartments.—The archbishop stands, with the queen and Duke of Norfolk, sponsor to the child of the Margrave of Baden.—The archbishop receives the communion with the queen.—Visit of the queen to the archbishop in 1560.—Noble members of Parker's household.—His table.—Provision for his wife.—For his children.—Death of Mrs. Parker.—Death of Parker's second son.—The queen visits Parker at Lambeth.—The queen's maundy.—She visits the archbishop at Croydon.—Visits him at Canterbury.—Parker's contemporaries.—Prepares his tomb.—His will.—Death and character . . . . . page 519





# SUCCESSION

OF

## ARCHBISHOPS AND CONTEMPORARY SOVEREIGNS.

Archbishop	Conse- cration	Consecrators	Acces- sion	Death	Contemporary Sovereign
Matthew Parker .	1559	{ Will. Chichester . . John Hereford . . . John Bedford . . . Miles ( <i>ex</i> ) Exeter . }	1559	1575	Elizabeth

TABLE  
OF  
CONTEMPORARY SOVEREIGNS.

A.D.	England	Scotland	Germany	France	Pope	Spain
1559	Elizabeth	Mary .	Ferdinand I.	Francis II.	Pius IV. . .	Philip II.
1560	. .	. .	. .	Charles IX.	. .	. .
1564	. .	. .	Maximilian II.	. .	. .	. .
1566	. .	. .	. .	. .	Pius V. . .	. .
1567	. .	James VI.	. .	. .	. .	. .
1572	. .	. .	. .	. .	Gregory XIII.	. .
1574	. .	. .	. .	Henry III.	. .	. .

# LIVES OF THE ARCHBISHOPS OF CANTERBURY.

---

## BOOK IV.—*continued.*

---

### CHAPTER V.

#### MATTHEW PARKER.

The Parker family.—Nicolas Parker, the founder.—William Parker.—His marriage with Alice Monins.—Birth of Matthew Parker.—His early education.—Death of his father.—Enters at Cambridge.—State of the University—Date of Parker's matriculation.—Takes his degree.—Master of his college.—Revenue of the college.—Foundation of the library.—Elected vice-chancellor.—Controversy with Bishop Gardyner.—Interview with Henry VIII.—Visitation of Cambridge in 1549.

THE FAMILY of Matthew Parker, the seventieth Archbishop of Canterbury, occupied a respectable position among the commercial aristocracy of the country, at a time when to the wholesale dealer in England the title of merchant

CHAP.  
V.  
Matthew  
Parker.  
1559–75.  
Parentage,  
birth, and  
education.

*Authorities.*—The works of John Strype, in the collections he has made from the public archives, are of incalculable value to the student of English history, whether civil or ecclesiastical. When we remember the

CHAP.  
V.

Matthew  
Parker.

1559-75.

prince was first attached. The founder of the family, or of its commercial prosperity, was Nicolas Parker, who, being by profession a notary public, was appointed by

difficulties, now removed, which attended such researches at the beginning of the eighteenth century, his incessant industry does indeed appear marvellous; but from the vast extent of his labours, and the haste in which some of his transcriptions were necessarily made, it would have been almost a miracle if he had been invariably accurate; while, at the same time, we have to complain of the careless manner in which the references to his authorities are given. Strype was not so much an historian as a collector of the materials of history; and the historian finds it necessary to verify the quotations of Strype, and to collate his transcriptions with the original, before he can venture to adopt them as authoritative. This labour in the nineteenth century is very different from what it was in the time of Strype. The present Master of the Rolls, with sagacious forethought, has not only provided means of easy access to the public documents under his custody, but he has, with a soundness of judgment seldom at fault, selected as editors of those documents which have been submitted to the press, scholars equally distinguished for their eminence in general literature and for their archæological studies; while in Sir Thomas Duffus Hardy the inquirer finds a living index to our national muniments, and one who takes pleasure in facilitating and abridging the labours of research. From these circumstances we may express surprise, while we give utterance to the complaint, that Strype has never had an editor. His works, as they issued from the Clarendon Press some years ago, are simply a reprint, and nothing more,—a reprint in which are often retained what were mere clerical blunders in the original edition. In works such as those which are attributed to Strype, what to the ordinary reader may appear to be a trivial error, may become a serious mistake, either hindering or misdirecting further research. An edition of Strype was contemplated by one eminently qualified to discharge the duties of an editor,—the late Dr. Maitland, whose papers have been placed in my hands. What has been said of Strype may be repeated with reference to Jeremy Collier. Collier, like Strype, had no acumen as a critic: the art of criticism in his days had scarcely come into existence; and while in the present generation it is the fashion to throw doubt upon every historic statement hitherto received as authentic, so, in Collier's time, the authenticity of traditional assertions was accepted, too often without sufficient examination. Collier is nevertheless the historian of the English Church. Later historians have done little more

Archbishop Stafford, in the year 1450, principal registrar of the Spiritual Court of Canterbury. On Nicolas Parker devolved the custody of all the public acts, muniments,

CHAP.  
V.  
Matthew  
Parker.  
1559-75.

than modernize the statements inartistically arranged by him, and expressed in what is now called a slipshod style. He invariably refers to contemporary authorities; and, having had occasion for many years to follow him, I may say that he quotes or translates, if not always correctly, always with intentional fairness. He is, on the whole, the most impartial historian with whom I am acquainted. His collections in the Appendix to his History are extremely valuable; but they are subject to the same detraction we adopt in reference to Strype. To the latter writer, Collier, as a learned divine, was much superior. To both Strype and Collier, Bishop Burnet is in every respect inferior; but his History of the Reformation has obtained, extrinsically, a value not pertaining to the work itself, in the fact that it possesses in Mr. Pocock an editor who, for accuracy and research, has seldom been equalled, and never surpassed. In preparing his edition of Burnet, Mr. Pocock has examined other documents relating to the Reformation, which, it is to be hoped, he may in due time commit to the press. In the mean time, his criticism on Burnet, the most unfair and prejudiced of historians, has thrown considerable light upon the history of the Reformation. Heylin also has found, in Canon Robertson, an editor worthy of a work, the merits of which are brought into stronger light by the ableness of his researches. To other collectors of public documents, such as Haynes, Forbes, D'Ewes, and the Cabala, it will be seen from the foot-notes that I am indebted; but as I have had to refer to them only occasionally, I forbear to offer with respect to them any critical remarks. I will only observe, that I have found it necessary, when quoting D'Ewes as an authority, to refer, in the first instance, to the Journals of Parliament. The brief sketch of his early history by Parker himself, and the 'Mathæus' appended to the 'De Antiquitate,' throw light upon his history. His letters, both of a private and of a public character, are invaluable to his biographer, and have been brought within easy access by their publication by the Parker Society, under the careful and judicious editorship of Mr. Bruce and the Rev. T. T. Perowne,—worthy representatives of Corpus Christi College, Cambridge. To the authorities of that college, literature in general is indebted for the careful preservation of the Parker Papers; and students in particular, for the readiness and the courtesy with which the literary treasures in their possession are opened to inspection.

CHAP.  
V.

Matthew  
Parker.

1559-75.

and registers of the entire province : and amid the fearful corruption of the spiritual courts, of which mention has been made in the life of Warham, it is no ordinary praise that, through a long period, the character of Nicolas Parker, for integrity, professional zeal, and sound judgment, was never impeached. Archbishop Stafford appointed him "out of regard to the honesty of his behaviour, and his other gifts of integrity and honour." When, in 1483, "broken in age, and hindered from business by many infirmities," he tendered his resignation to Archbishop Bourchier, the archbishop refused to receive it, but appointed an assistant. Nicolas Parker did not long enjoy his comparative retirement : the last document we possess to which his name is attached bears the date of June, 1484. About that time he died at his house in Ivy Lane, in the parish of St. Faith's in the city of London.

It is to be recorded to the credit of Nicolas Parker, that, while holding an office in which, through speculation and extortion, fortunes had been dishonestly made, he bequeathed no fortune to his descendants, but only the competence which enabled them to make a fair start in business. But, although he would not pollute his soul by the dishonest acquisition of filthy lucre, he participated in the general feeling of the age, and by obtaining a grant of arms, he established the gentility of his family. At that time, the College of Heralds was a reality, and no one could venture to assume a coat of arms until he could prove his right to the distinction at the visitation of the heralds. Parker bore for his coat of arms, on a field gules, three keys erected ; and so important did the archbishop think this distinction, that, when he desired to establish a distinct branch of the family, he obtained for it an addition to the shield,—a chevron charged with three resplendent estoiles. The age was



in this respect punctilious, and in heraldry three classes existed. Arms paternal and hereditary were transmitted to the descendants of the original grantee: the son becoming a gentleman of the second coat armour, the grandson a gentleman of blood, the great-grandson a gentleman of ancestry.

The grandson of Nicolas, William Parker—the archbishop's father—was a tradesman in Norwich, a calenderer of stuffs. The fact of his being a gentleman of blood was of service to him, no doubt, when he sought to ally himself by marriage with “the worshipful house of Monins, or Monings.” This was a Kentish family, a branch of which had originally migrated from Norfolk. From the manner in which the marriage is referred to by the contemporaries of the archbishop, it is evident that, when William Parker was married to Alice Monins, he was regarded as having made a good match; and such in every respect his marriage was. It was through his mother that Matthew Parker was related to the Earl of Nottingham. His grandmother\* was Alicia, daughter of John Carey, gentleman, of Snetisham, in the county of Norfolk; and Matthew Parker's uncle had, apparently, married another member of the same family. The Careys of Snetisham and Carey Lord Hunsdon, a relative of Queen Elizabeth, were originally of the same trunk. Katharine, the daughter of Henry Carey Lord Hunsdon, in the reign of Elizabeth, was the first wife of Charles Howard, first Earl of Nottingham. If we may say of any fact of history, that it is unimportant, we might be tempted to pay little regard to such a statement as this, were it not that it implies a reason for the presence of the Earl of Nottingham at Parker's consecration, his testimony to which transaction being, as we shall here-

CHAP.  
V.

Matthew  
Parker.

1559–75.

His  
mother,  
Alice  
Monins.

Earl of  
Notting-  
ham.

\* See original pedigree, A 211–12, at Heralds' College.

CHAP.  
V.Matthew  
Parker.  
1559-75.

after have occasion to show, of considerable controversial value.

The marriage of William Parker and Alice Monins was productive of much domestic happiness, although they had to mourn the loss in early life of two children, who died before the birth of Matthew. Matthew was the eldest of the children who survived his father. Of Botolph, the next son, we know little, except that he was in holy orders; but the name of Thomas, next in the family succession, will frequently occur in these pages. Thomas Parker became a tradesman of Norwich, though it does not appear whether he pursued his father's business or not. Between him and Matthew a cordial friendship existed, and on several occasions Thomas was able to render assistance to his brother, in whose household, after Matthew's consecration, he held an important post. It was a proud day for Thomas when, as Mayor of Norwich, he publicly entertained his brother, the Lord Archbishop of Canterbury, Primate of all England, and Metropolitan. Matthew Parker felt justly proud when, the first peer in parliament next to royalty itself, he pointed to the circumstance of his having risen to this eminence from that great middle class with which, through his brother, he continued to be connected. There was a sister named Margaret.

Biographi-  
cal memo-  
randums.

In the biographical memorandums preserved in Corpus Christi College, Cambridge, Matthew Parker refers in the following quaint terms to his early years, and his primary education:—\*

\* These memorandums are written on a small roll of parchment. It is evident that they were made at various times, sometimes long after the events recorded took place, and probably towards the close of the archbishop's life. Hence they cannot always be taken as chronologically correct. Their accuracy must be tested by reference to other records. They do not extend beyond Parker's consecration.



“In the year of our Lord 1504, on the 6th of August, the letter G and F, Matthew Parker was born, at Norwich, in the parish of St. Saviour; and was brought up in the parish of All Saints, near Fyebridge Gates, and educated in the parish of St. Clement, near Fyebridge, under William his father, who lived to 1516 and to the 40th year of his age, and Alice his mother, who lived to A.D. 1553 and to the 83rd year of her age.

CHAP.  
V.

Matthew  
Parker.  
1559-75.

<p>“He was instructed:</p>	<p>{</p>	in reading: 1.	<p>} by</p>	Thomas Benis, Bachelor of
		in writing: 2.		Theology, Rector of St.
		in singing: 3.		Clement’s, and partly by
		in grammar: 4.		Richard Pope, priest.
				William Prior, clerk of the
				church of St. Benedict.
				W. Love, priest; R. Man-
				thorp, clerk; of St. Ste-
				phen’s—severe teachers.
				William Neve, an easy
				and kind schoolmaster.”

When Matthew was only twelve years of age, his father died. This severe calamity proved, however, to be a loss not irreparable, since his mother, in the course of a few years, selected for her second husband Mr. Baker, who loved his wife’s children, and watched over them as tenderly as over his own only son.

Death of  
his father.  
1516.

John Baker, the second husband of Mrs. Parker, is simply described as “gentleman,” by which we are probably to understand, that although he was not a landed proprietor, he was, nevertheless, not engaged in trade.\*

John  
Baker, his  
stepfather.

\* “As for gentlemen,” says Sir Thomas Smith, “they be made good cheape in England. For who soever studieth the lawes of the realme, who studieth in the Universities, who professeth liberall Sciences: and, to be short, who can live idly, and without manuall labour, and will beare the port, charge and countenance of a Gentleman, hee shall bee called master, for that is the title which men geve to esquires and other gentlemen, and shall bee taken for Gentlemen.”—Smith’s Commonwealth of England. According to Jacob, in his Law Dictionary, “a gentleman may be defined to be one who, without any

CHAP.

V.

Matthew  
Parker.

1559-75.

By her second husband, the mother of Matthew Parker had a son, John Baker by name. To this half-brother, Matthew became much attached, and found in him, at all times, a sympathizing friend, ready with his assistance whenever it was required and could be had.

It was the custom in most families of the middle class to select one son to be educated as a scholar; and it is evident that Matthew's father had destined him to a university education. His mother determined to fulfil the wishes of her first husband, and at her own expense to support her eldest son at Cambridge.

Goes to  
Cam-  
bridge.

A native of Norwich had certain advantages at Cambridge, which may have influenced Matthew Parker to select that university; and one of his masters having been educated at Bene't College, his mother may have been persuaded by him to enter her son as a member of that house. But there were other reasons for choosing Cambridge. Whether we can account for the fact or not, a fact it certainly is, that almost all our distinguished men, at this period, were Cambridge men. Until this time, Cambridge had occupied a very secondary place among the universities of Europe as compared with Oxford, and the name of this university was little known on the Continent at a time when Oxford challenged an equality with Paris; but during the early days of the Refor-

State of  
Cam-  
bridge.

title, bears a coat of arms, and whose ancestors have been freemen; and by the coat a gentleman giveth, he is known to be, or not to be, descended from those of his name who lived many hundred years ago." Selden, in his *Titles of Honour*, p. 705, states that a gentleman is "one that, either from the blood of his Ancestors, or the favour of his Sovereign, or of them that have power of sovereignty in them, or from his own vertue, employment or otherwise, according to the Laws and customs of honour in the Country we speak of, is ennobled, and made Gentile, or so raised to an eminency, above the multitude, perpetually inherent in his person, that by those Laws and customs he be truly Nobilis or noble, whether he have any of the precedent Titles or not."

mation, both statesmen and divines gave the preference to Cambridge. The residence of Erasmus at this university may have added to its fame; but the question recurs, why should Erasmus prefer Cambridge on his second visit to England, when at his first visit he took up his abode at Oxford, and acknowledged his obligations to many Oxford scholars? We have one answer, doubtless, in the fact that he was invited to Cambridge by Bishop Fisher: but his discomforts were great, and he complained of his hard fare, and that "the ale was raw, small, and windy;" he declared that it was not "*vis Cereris*, but Ceres vitiated, and therefore justly called *Cervesia*."\* We may suspect that, under such circumstances, the Epicurean scholar would have removed to the more luxurious university, if there had not been some impediment offered to his removal. This impediment we find in the opposition offered at Oxford to the study of Greek. When we are told that so great a man as Sir Thomas More interfered in the disputes between the Trojans and Greeks at Oxford, we may fairly conjecture that these disputes were more than "a university row" among the younger members. Other circumstances, too, may induce us to suppose that an opposition was offered by the heads of colleges to an innovation which, it was asserted, was closely connected with heresy. At Cambridge, undoubtedly, the study of Greek literature was encouraged, and at the same time a spirit in favour of a reformation of the Church prevailed.

There is some difficulty in fixing precisely the time of Matthew Parker's matriculation. He himself, in the

CHAP.  
V.

Matthew  
Parker.

1559-75.

Date of his  
matricu-  
lation.

\* Fuller, to whom we are indebted for the pleasantry, will by no means admit its justice. He vindicates the character of Cambridge ale, "until the innovation of beer, the child of hops, was brought into England."

CHAP.

V.

Matthew  
Parker.

1559-75.

memorandums already referred to, asserts that he went to Cambridge on the 8th of September, 1522. But the memorandums, as we have observed, were made from recollection at a later period of life, and not when the occurrences actually took place. His memorandum with reference to Cambridge stands thus: "On the 8th of September, 1522, about the seventeenth year of my age, I was sent to Cambridge, by the help of Mr. Bunge, of the parish of St. George; but at my mother's expense." \* Mr. Bunge used his influence to obtain an admission for the young man into the university; but Parker is careful to add, that for a university education he was indebted solely to his mother's self-denying generosity. The difficulty which here occurs is this, that in the year 1522, young Parker was in his eighteenth year, not in his seventeenth, since he was born in August, 1504. He incidentally supplies an explanation. Among the MSS. of C. C. C. there is a paper by Bishop Gardynier, to which Parker appends the following note: *hoc anno in festo Nativitatis Beatæ Mariæ M. P. accessit Cantabrigiam*. Now the festival to which reference is here made certainly falls on the 8th of September, but this document is dated *anno millesimo quingentesimo vicesimo primo*.

I think that I can show cause why Parker, writing towards the close of life, should make this mistake; and I do so to point out how the veriest trifles may be of importance in history, and how necessary it is to pay attention to minute particulars. On referring to Hall's Chronicle, I find that, in the Lent of 1521, the jail fever made its appearance in Cambridge, and raged to such an

\* The memorandum is in Latin, and stands thus: A.D. 1522, 8 Septem. circa annum ætatis meæ 17, missus Cantabrigiam opera Mri. Bunge, Parochiæ Sancti Georgii, sed sumptibus matris, in Colleg. Corporis Christi.



extent, proving so frequently fatal, not only to the prisoners, but to a vast number of persons in the town and neighbourhood, that, in order to escape infection, all who had the means made their escape from the place. That an anxious mother would recall her son from what had become a pest-house, almost as soon as he had reached his destination, we may feel quite certain; and we shall not be far wrong if we presume that the young student matriculated in the year 1521, but that he did not come into residence until the year 1522.\*

Matthew Parker was admitted a member of Corpus Christi College, or, as it was generally called till a late period, Bene't College, of which he lived to become a generous benefactor.†

In these days, a college in a university is regarded as little more than a school for adults. In Parker's time, a college—being thus distinguished from a monastery—was regarded as a society of secular clerks who were associated for the purpose of prosecuting their studies. Some lay members were admitted to manage the secular business, and to regulate the affairs of the institution. The income of this society was derived from landed property, held upon certain conditions, among which was the education of a given number of pupils, who were to receive board and lodging within the precincts.

In the middle ages, as we have seen, independent members,—persons who, without being attached to a college, desired to attend the lectures of the university,—

\* See MSS. C. C. C. C., cvi. Art. 63. Strype gives the date 1520, which is clearly a mistake.

† This college acquired the name of Bene't probably from its vicinity to the church of that name. This adventitious title was admitted even in legal documents, whenever the college was styled "the College of Corpus Christi and the Blessed Virgin Mary, commonly called Bene't College." Masters' Hist. of Corpus Christi College.

CHAP.

V.

Matthew  
Parker.

1559-75.

lodged at first in private houses, and then in halls, which were placed under the surveillance of the university authorities. When it was found that this arrangement was insufficient to secure the proper discipline, colleges were induced to receive independent members, in addition to the scholars on the foundation. This arrangement was found to be profitable; but in times when it was still difficult to maintain discipline,\* and when there was small accommodation for students not on the foundation, the fellows were accustomed to hire or purchase a hostel. A hostel is described as a convictorium, or boarding-house, over which, when it was attached to a college, one of the fellows presided, and where lectures were given.

Attached to Corpus Christi College was the hostel of St. Mary, and here young Parker at first took up his abode.†

Although he complains of his tutor, Robert Cooper, that, notwithstanding his being a master of arts, he was, nevertheless, a man of small learning, yet Parker laboured so diligently at his studies, for the purpose of exonerating his mother from the expense of his education, that so early as the month of March, 1522-3, he obtained a bible-clerkship in his college. This bible-clerkship was a scholarship, to which certain duties were attached. It

\* Flagellation was still resorted to. Fuller mentions that the Lady Margaret being, once upon a time, a visitor at Christ's College, saw the dean of the college administering corporal punishment to one of the members. The compassionate princess did not go so far as to call upon the executioner to stop, but simply exclaimed, "Lente!" Fuller, 108.

† Masters, in his history of the college, p. 74, throws a doubt upon the fact of Parker's residence in the hotel. He surely cannot have read, or he had rather forgotten, that Parker, in his biographical memoirs, unequivocally declares the fact: "Edoctus partim in Hospitio Divæ Mariæ; partim in Collegio (Corporis) Christi."

had been founded, in the reign of Henry VII., by the Duchess of Norfolk—a lady to whose munificence the college was in other respects indebted. Parker now removed into the college.

CHAP.  
V.

Matthew  
Parker.

1559–75.

It is said of Parker, that from the commencement of his university career, he was “a painful student.” But public examinations had become a mere formality; and the consequence was, that every student shaped his studies according to his inclination, and with a view to what would be serviceable to him in after life. The old university system, which in former times had answered its purpose by enforcing mental exertion, had now become obsolete; and when the whole field of literature was in a transitional state, no new system had been authoritatively adopted. The condition of the university when Parker came into residence, was not unlike that which is represented as its condition towards the close of the eighteenth century. Certain formal exercises were required of the candidates for a degree; but the examination was conducted,—not with alarming severity,—by masters of arts selected by the person who presented himself for examination. Idleness met with no punishment. But, on the other hand, when a young man desired to make himself a proficient in any department of human learning, he was sure to find learned men ready and happy to assist him. Every facility for his improvement was offered him: there were public lectures delivered from time to time by accomplished professors; libraries were open to him—a vast advantage when books were rare and dear; and he associated with some of the first wits of the age.

Hence it came to pass, that in the sixteenth, as in the eighteenth century, the university could produce the most opposite characters. Men who in after life proved, owing to their youthful idleness, to be disqualified

CHAP.  
V.

Matthew  
Parker.

1559-75.

for the discharge of the duties which, from circumstances, might devolve upon them, threw the blame from themselves upon the university. Even if by later studies they had remedied past deficiencies, they would exaggerate their own merits by depreciating the university, to which, as they could make it appear, they owed nothing. Whereas, on the other hand, those who—like Parker and others among his contemporaries—had resisted every temptation to idleness, and had mastered all the learning of the age, would refer with gratitude to the happy days they passed, when, assisted and assisting, they received instruction from their elders to impart it to the younger members of the community; when, in the midst of friendly intercourse, they could understand experimentally the saying of the wise man: “Iron sharpeneth iron; so a man sharpeneth the countenance of his friend.”\*

It was the characteristic of Parker’s mind to do what his hand found to do with his might. He therefore directed his attention to dialectics and philosophy, and, by so doing, he subjected his mind to a discipline most important in a controversial age. The soil was ploughed and drilled, as it were, and so prepared for the sowing of intellectual seed, when he directed his attention to theological study. His philosophical studies included the works of Duns Scotus and Thomas Aquinas; and these studies implied an intimate acquaintance with Scripture.

B.A. 1525.  
Subdeacon.  
con. 1526.  
Deacon  
and priest.  
1527.

He took his degree of Bachelor of Arts in 1525; and on the 22nd of December in the following year, he became a subdeacon. He was ordained deacon on the 20th of April, and priest on the 15th of June, 1527.

Antecedently to his ordination he returned to his home at Norwich, and it was under the title of “Barwell and

\* Proverbs xxvii. 17.



the Chapel in the Fields" that he commenced his pastoral labours.

CHAP.  
V.

Matthew  
Parker.  
1559-75.

That Parker was early distinguished as a scholar is apparent from the fact, that, when he was only a young man, two or three and twenty years of age, he was one of the Cambridge men who were selected to hold office in the new college which Cardinal Wolsey was founding at Oxford. Parker was not an ambitious man, and preferred remaining at Cambridge, where a fellowship in his own college was contemporaneously offered for his acceptance. Although, as has been said, he was not ambitious of a high position, he always desired to excel, and to take the lead in any department of human exertion to which he might be called; he therefore now devoted himself to the service of the college and university, to which he became attached.

About the time of his election to his fellowship, he took his degree of Master of Arts: the exact date of his degree has not been ascertained, but it was probably in the summer of 1528. From this time, he devoted himself to theological studies; but he did not graduate in divinity till the 14th of July, 1535, and he deferred taking his degree of Doctor of Divinity till the 1st of July, 1538.

M.A. 1528.

B.D. 1535.

D.D. 1538.

Long before that event, he had, however, established a high character as a preacher. He had been introduced to court, and was now regarded as a rising man.

The narrative of these events, and an account of his studies in divinity will be reserved for separate chapters. We shall, at present, confine attention to his academical career, both in his college and in the university.

The mastership of his college became vacant in 1544, by the death of William Soworde, B.D., and, under

Master of  
the col-  
lege. 1544.

CHAP.  
V.Matthew  
Parker.  
1559-75.

royal mandate, Matthew Parker was appointed his successor.\*

In this document, Parker is described as a man "as well for his approved learning, wisdom, and honesty, as for his singular grace and industry in bringing up youth in virtue and learning, so apt for the exercise of the said room"—i. e. mastership—"that it is thought very hard to find the like for all respects and purposes."

His con-  
duct as  
master of  
his college.

In the measures proposed for the improvement of the college, the new master found his fellows prepared to co-operate, and he instantly commenced his work of reform.

For the better management of the benefactions placed at the disposal of the college, regulations were speedily adopted. Among these may be noted "Billingford's hutch," or chest, a fund to assist the needy members of the college by an occasional loan, to be advanced under certain stipulations. This is specially noticed, because it affords an instance of the watchful piety of Matthew Parker. He required that every one who should have recourse to the hutch, should offer up a prayer with the custodians, for the benefit of Billingford's soul. At this time, when prayers for the dead were allowable, he did not forget his own especial benefactress, the Duchess of Norfolk, nor her sister the Lady Eleanor Butler. He made provision that she who had endowed the bible-clerkship, which had offered to him the first step on the ladder of promotion, should be remembered in the prayers of that community which had been enriched by her munificence. The accounts of the college were in

\* The king's letter is still preserved. The royal signature was affixed to it by a stamp. MS. cxiv. 2, Nasmith. It is printed in a note to Masters' history of the college, and in the Appendix to Strype. For all that relates to Corpus Christi College, the reader is referred to Masters and Lamb; and, for an account of the original documents, to Nasmith.

great confusion, and the first step taken by Parker was to reduce them to order. The sources of the collegiate income he carefully investigated, and economically regulated the expenses. He discovered arrears of rent, and much property lost by the carelessness or peculation of bursars in times past he reclaimed. Inventories of the college possessions were made under his direction, and account books are still in existence, which, written by his own hand, or engrossed under his direction, are living attestations of his accuracy. When the accounts were reduced to order, the income of the college was found to be as follows:—

CHAP.  
V.  
Matthew.  
Parker.  
1559–75.

*Corpus Christi College.\**

	£	s.	d.
The master, for stipend and commons . . .	6	13	4
Nine fellows, of whom eight are priests, who have each per annum 5 <i>l.</i> 6 <i>s.</i> 8 <i>d.</i> , and one not priest, 4 <i>l.</i> . . . . .	46	13	4
Three bible-clerks, 2 <i>l.</i> per annum each . . .	6	0	0
Ministers, namely, manciple, for commons, 2 <i>l.</i> 3 <i>s.</i> 4 <i>d.</i> , and stipend, 6 <i>s.</i> 8 <i>d.</i> Cook, for commons, 2 <i>l.</i> 3 <i>s.</i> 4 <i>d.</i> , and for stipend, 6 <i>s.</i> 8 <i>d.</i> . . . . .	5	0	0
Distributions annually between the master and fellows for their liveries . . . . .	6	0	0
Exequies, alms, and refectations . . . . .	10	2	3
Fees, namely of Mr. Cooke (steward of all the possessions), 13 <i>s.</i> 4 <i>d.</i> Collector of the rents, 2 <i>l.</i> Surveyor of all the possessions, 3 <i>l.</i> 6 <i>s.</i> 8 <i>d.</i> . . . . .	6	0	0
Expenses extraordinary, 5 <i>l.</i> Fuel, 2 <i>l.</i> Purchase of utensils, 2 <i>l.</i> 10 <i>s.</i> Repairs, 96 <i>l.</i> 3 <i>s.</i> 4 <i>d.</i>	105	13	4
Total . . . . .	192	2	3
Total of the clear revenues . . . . .	171	7	6
So the total expenses exceed the total revenue . . . . .	£20	14	9

\* Masters' History of Corpus Christi College, App. No. 24.

CHAP.

V.

Matthew  
Parker.

1559-75.

He was economical in order that he might be generous, and incited his brethren to acts of munificence by his own example. Having, by his industry and firmness, increased the income of the college, instead of adding that increased income to the dividends of the existing members, he persuaded his brethren to establish two new fellowships and six scholarships. It certainly is interesting, and it may be of some importance, to know what was considered in those days a sufficient endowment, or nearly so, in the University of Cambridge. Accordingly, I have to remark that each scholar had for his commons an allowance of eightpence a week, which was afterwards augmented to a shilling, with a small additional allowance per annum for his laundress and his barber. He had a chamber provided for him, and was exonerated from the payment of college fees.\* Candidates for the new scholarships were to be competently learned in grammar, and a preference was to be given to the poorest children, provided they were likely to proceed in arts, and to make divinity their study. In addition to what was done by the college, Parker, out of his private resources, endowed two fellowships and five scholarships. Each fellow was to have six pounds a year for his stipend, and chambers were provided for him. The fellows were to be Norfolk men, and were to undertake gratuitously the instruction of scholars who came from Norwich.

In the fellowships endowed by the college he secured a preference for Norfolk men, on the ground that it was from that county most of the benefactors of that college came. By those who like to speak disparagingly of every

\* Of the establishment of a professor we have an account in Strype's Life of Sir Thomas Smith. We are told that Smith kept three servants, three guns, three winter geldings, which, together with his own board, cost him thirty pounds a year.



generous action, Parker was sneered at for having be-Nor-folcked his college; but Fuller, in his usual quaint style, observes, "The worst I can wish this college is, that they may have the like benefactor, who, on the same terms, may be partial to the same college." If it were intended to insinuate that his attachment to his native place—that kind of feeling which our ancestors delighted to cultivate as the germ of patriotism—implied any narrowness of mind on the part of Parker, the calumny is refuted by the fact, that he gave 63*l.* 13*s.* 4*d.* to Gonville and Caius College for the maintenance of a student educated in the Cathedral School of Canterbury, at the nomination of the Archbishop of Canterbury: to this he added both plate and books. A similar sum, with plate and books, he conferred on Trinity Hall.

CHAP.

V.

Matthew  
Parker.

1559-75.

The wisdom with which his benevolence was directed, was exemplified in the regulations he made with reference to his greatest benefaction,—the library which he instituted in Corpus Christi College, Cambridge, and which is celebrated not only in England, but throughout the civilized world.

Founds  
the  
library.

It must indeed in justice be admitted, that he was not the first to found a library in his college; but when we refer to the library bequeathed to the college by Dr. Markaunt, in 1417, we must add that, although the legacy was peculiarly valuable, considering the age in which it was made, Dr. Markaunt's bequest only amounted to seventy-six volumes. To this an addition was made by the liberality of Dr. Nobys; but the whole library was in such a dilapidated state when Dr. Parker became master, that of the present library he may be regarded as the founder. By him the keepers of Billingford's hutch were made the custodians of the library; and he ordered that if the chains which attached the books to the desks

CHAP.  
V.

Matthew  
Parker.

1559-75.

were broken, or any damage were done to the books, the chains and books were to be repaired at the college expense.

The monastic libraries had been damaged, when not destroyed, by mobs, seeking plunder with the cant of reformation on their lips. When the jewelled and embossed bindings had been torn from the books, the books themselves could be purchased at small price. Parker availed himself of the opportunity thus placed within his reach, to make a collection of MSS. and printed books. These, when bequeathed to his college, formed, in the words of Fuller, "the sun of English antiquity, until it was eclipsed by Sir Robert Cotton." To the works contained in this library we are indebted for the chief materials of English history, civil and ecclesiastical. Some of the most valuable of the documents are now in print; but the originals are carefully preserved for collation, as well as for the inspection, of archæologists. The stringent regulations made by Parker for the preservation of his library are many of them still in force, and the successive masters and fellows of Corpus Christi College, Cambridge, have proved themselves worthy of the treasures committed to their care. The college is honourably spoken of by grateful students, for the courtesy shown, and the facilities afforded to them in their investigations.

Library  
regula-  
tions.

Dr. Parker attended to the comforts of the college by giving, for the support of the hall-fire from the feast of All Saints to Candlemass, no less a sum than a hundred pounds. He obtained a licence of mortmain for enabling them to hold a hundred pounds per annum more than they were at that time possessed of, and fitted up chambers in the college for the scholarships by him endowed. He added four hundred pounds for the increase of the commons of the master, fellows, and scholars; and

he undertook, at his sole charge, so many public works, that he received a vote of thanks from the vice-chancellor and the senate.

CHAP.  
V.  
Matthew  
Parker.

1559-75.

It is only just to the memory of Dr. Parker to mention these things, because, by writers who have "evil-will at our Zion," he is sometimes mentioned as grasping and avaricious.

That he was economical, as most persons who have afforded to be public benefactors have certainly been, is not to be denied; and when his undoubted property was sometimes withheld from him by the despotism of Elizabeth and the mean arts of her courtiers, he was obliged to contend vigorously for his rights. But let his actions speak for themselves.

After mentioning his munificence, as evinced not only to Corpus Christi College and the University of Cambridge generally, Masters refers to his benefactions to Canterbury and Norwich, and continues :—

Benefac-  
tions to  
Canter-  
bury and  
Norwich.

"As a further specimen of his bounty to the corporation of Norwich, he gave them a magnificent gilt bason and ewer, weighing 175 oz.; in acknowledgment of which, with his many other singular favours conferred upon them, they sent him a letter of thanks, and at the same time entered into a covenant with this society, whereby they bound themselves, under a penalty of 100*l.*, never to alienate it, unless in a case of urgent necessity, and then not without the approbation of the masters of this college and of Trinity Hall. The two colleges gave bonds in like manner, of 20*l.* each, for their cups and covers; yea, such was his liberality, that, within the four first years after his advancement, he gave the servants of his household, in leases of lands, rectories, &c., 1,291*l.* 13*s.* 4*d.* beyond his yearly gifts amongst them, amounting to 2,017*l.* His foundations of fellowships, scholarships, increase of commons, &c., cost him 2,000*l.*, whilst his yearly disbursements were 2,400*l.* He gave Nevile 100*l.* for his book, laid out

CHAP.  
V.

Matthew  
Parker.  
1559-75.

500*l.* upon the University Street, and 1,400*l.* upon his palaces, when the value of the archbishopric did not exceed 3,428*l.* per annum. All his goods and chattels, at the time of his death, amounted to no more than 2,766*l.*; whereas his legacies, funeral charges, debts, &c., exceeded 3,376*l.*, which deficiency was made up by his son out of the estate he left behind: but the whole produce of this not being much above a hundred pounds a year, he was put to difficulties in doing it; as it appears, both from the smallness of the sums the college was obliged to accept, and from the time he took to pay in the remainder of the five hundred pounds that was unpaid at his father's death. Yea, such was his dilatoriness herein, that, by reason thereof, they were once forced to borrow fifty pounds of Dr. Hatcher upon a pawn of their plate."\*

Vice-chancellor of  
Cambridge.  
1544-5.

Such was Parker as the head of a house. We proceed to offer some remarks upon his conduct to the university in general. Soon after his appointment as master of his college, he became vice-chancellor of the university. The communication was made to him by his friend, Dr. Mere, in January, 1544-5.† Dr. Mere states, that the proctors were very desirous that he should return home as soon as possible, to undergo the formalities of admission. He mentions that there was a canvass for Dr. Ridley and Dr. Standish, but their interest was divided by the appearance in the field of Mr. Atkinson, the vice-provost of King's College. It appears from the voting paper that the votes were, for Ridley, five; for Atkinson, six; for Standish, eight; for Parker, seventy-nine. Dr. Mere concludes his letter thus: "I pray you have me commended to Mr. Baker, both young and old, to your brother Thomas, and all their wives." There is a letter, in the handwriting of Mere, announcing Parker's re-election in

\* Masters' History of Corpus Christi College, Cambridge, p. 108.

† I infer the date of the letter from the voting paper appended to it. Corresp. p. 19.



February, 1547-8. It is amusing, from the incidental information it conveys. He informs Parker that he was elected almost *unanimi consensu*. He adds: "Many more long for your coming, and most more wishing that ye will in any wise take it. Mr. —\* would have had you to supper on Thursday, for it was a play; on Friday likewise, a tragedy; and then very earnestly he wished you. He had at his drinking, which was with jowls of fresh salmon, &c., Drs. Redmand, Glyn, Hatcher, Mr. Sands, Grindal, the Minor Proctor, Masters Pilkington, Christopherson, Gonell, and Aylond."† I give these names, denoting the associates of Parker at this time, as most of them, at a later period, rose to distinction.

CHAP.  
V.  
Matthew  
Parker.  
1559-75.  
Re-elected.  
1547-8.

Parker's health was never good, and on that account he received a dispensation enabling him to eat meat in Lent. Dr. May, through whom the dispensation was obtained, observes: "Your sickness is sufficient licence and dispensation for you to receive, *absque scandalo*, that meat which is most meet for you."‡

From that time Dr. Parker was always ready to show his hospitality. We read of his entertaining the visitors in Edward the Sixth's time, when supplying the place of the vice-chancellor for the time being.

But he had, through the divided state of the university, many difficulties to contend with. Soon after his first appointment as vice-chancellor, he was involved in a controversy with Bishop Gardyner on the subject of a play which had been acted in the university. He was accused by Cuthbert Scott, who, under Queen Mary, became Bishop of Chester, of permitting some of the essentials of religion to be turned into ridicule. This had been frequently done in the satirical plays permitted

Contro-  
versy with  
Bishop  
Gardyner.

\* This name has been erased in the MS.

† Corresp. p. 37.

‡ Ibid. p. 38.

CHAP.  
V.

Matthew  
Parker.  
1559-75.

and encouraged by Crumwell in London; but there appears to have been no fair ground of objection in the present case. Some follies of the monks and some superstitions were exposed, but care had been taken to avoid anything approaching blasphemy.

Parker observed, that he had "used the wisdom of the doctors and presidents of all the colleges of the university for the trial of the truth concerning the tragedy." The fellows of every college were consulted, and by their verdict Parker was acquitted of all blame.

In Cuthbert Scott's own college, only one of the fellows was found to support him.

The haughty spirit of Gardyner could ill brook opposition, and he brought this trifling affair under the cognizance of the Privy Council. In the mildness of the Council's rebuke we may suspect an implied censure on the irate chancellor himself. They simply admonished the "heads and governors of the university to act with greater precaution for the future." \*

Gardyner, mortified by the little weight he possessed at Cambridge, determined to enforce by authority what he could not win by influence. He had now recourse to a railing accusation, evidently for the purpose of irritating his opponents. Writing to Parker, he says: "I hear many things to be very far out of order, both openly in the university and severally in the colleges; whereof I am sorry; and amongst other, in contempt of me, the determination of the pronounciation of certain Grece letters agreed unto by the whole university to be violatè and broken without any correction therefor. The motive is low, and the contempt so much the more. I was chosen chancellor, to be so honoured (although above my deserts) of them, and I

\* Documents, Corpus Christi College, Cambridge, p. 53.

have given no cause to be despised. I will do that I can for the maintenance of good order there, and challenge again of duty to be regarded after the proportion, not of my qualities, but of mine office." \*

CHAP.  
V.  
Matthew  
Parker.  
1559-75.

The chancellor's style is so confused, that we can only arrive at its general meaning. He refers to a controversy then in progress, and in which he had already committed himself, on the proper mode of pronouncing the Greek language. The few scholars who studied Greek at this time in Cambridge, were divided into two parties, the Itacists and the Etists.† The Itacists represented the original Greek scholars, who were taught by modern Greeks, and pronounced the language according to accent, and as the living tongue is still spoken. The Etists claimed for their leader no less a scholar than Erasmus, and he was followed by Sir Thomas Smith and Sir John Cheke, who were the friends, and in some sense the pupils, of Parker. About two years before his dispute with the latter, Gardynier, who now alluded to the controversy, as an indirect mode of attacking and annoying his vice-chancellor, had adopted a method of settling the dispute, which, if generally adopted, would easily settle all disputes.

Iotacists  
and Etists.

His letter to a predecessor of Parker's, while it exhibits

\* Documents, Corpus Christi College, Cambridge, p. 56. I shall have presently to mention some acts of kindness on the part of Gardynier to men of the party of the Reformation. Gardynier was evidently an overbearing man, who resented the slightest opposition to his will or opinions; but, at the same time, to those who yielded to him and courted him, he was kind and gracious. The two characters are quite compatible; but, as men remember injuries longer than they remember kindnesses, he was one of the most unpopular men of the age. In the life of Pole, I have shown that his character was not so bad as is represented by Foxe and the historians who blindly followed the martyrologist.

† Thus I find the word; but surely they ought to have styled themselves Iotacists.

CHAP.

V.

Matthew  
Parker.

1559-75.

Gardynner as a scholar, is characteristic of the man who wrote it, and of the age in which it was written :—

“The last yere, by consent of the hol universitie, I made an ordre concernyng pronounciation of the Greke tonge, appoynting paynes to the transgressors, and finally to the Vicechaunceler if he sawe them not executed, wherein I praye youe be persuaded, that I will not be deluded and contempned. I did it seriously, and wyl mayntayne it. If youe see the transgressors punished I have cause to be contented, but otherwise I entende in your and in the proctour’s persons to use myne authoritie given me by the universitie whereunto I trust ye will not enforce me. To be chaunceler of the universitie is oonly honour which by contempt is taken awaye, and I wyl be ware to give any man cause to contempne me. What information I have I wyll not wryte; but by that I shall see from henceforth I wyl byleve that is past. How necessary it is to brydle the arrogance of youngest the experience of your yeres hath I doubt not taught youe, and it wold much greve me privately to have any varyance with youe with whom I have had soo olde acquayntance. Which cannot be if ye suffre them not by tolleration to hope more of youe thenne ye wold avowe they shulde. The Kinges Majestie hath, by the inspiration of the Holy Goost, componed all maturs of religion, which uniformities I pray God it maye in that and in all other thinges extende unto us, and forgetting all that is past go forth in agrement as though ther had been noo such matur; but I wyl withstande fancies even in pronounciation, and fight with the enemye of quiet at the first entree. Wherefore I praye youe, Master Vicechaunceler, loke earnestly on these matures, and geve me cause by your industrie to rejoyse in the universitie, and oonly to care for acqyeting our materes with the towne, wherein I trust we shal have good speede by the grace of God, who sende youe hartely well to fare.

“At the courte the xvth of Maye.

“Your assured loving Frende,

“STE. WINTON.” \*

\* Documents, Corpus Christi College, Cambridge, p. 44.



The authority of Gardynier was quietly ignored.

While he was vice-chancellor, Parker was brought into correspondence with the Bishop of London, Dr. Bonner. Bishop Bonner made complaint that, among the graduates of Cambridge, scarcely any of late years had proffered their services to preach at Paul's Cross; "whereof," he says, "I greatly marvel, and suppose the same rather to proceed for that they have not been specially incited thereunto. I thought it good, for the honest love particularly I bear to you for your good qualities, besides the love I bear to you for your brother's sake, and also for the very hearty affection I bear to your university, to write unto you hereby, that ye will exhort such as ye know apt and meet for that purpose."

Bonner was at this time a more advanced Protestant than Parker. Being suspected of Romanizing tendencies by Henry VIII., he vindicated his character in a preface to Gardynier's work, *De verâ Obedientiâ*. In this he declares "the Pope's pay in England to be almost as great as the revenues of the crown;" and he remarks, that although "the Pope was a very ravening wolf dressed in sheep's clothing, yet he assumed the title of servant of the servants of God."\*

At this time the courtiers of Henry VIII. began to cast greedy eyes upon the property of the university and of the colleges. The king was solicited to appoint a commission, under the act for the dissolution of chantries and hospitals, with the view of ascertaining the nature and extent of the collegiate property, in the hope that some of his courtiers might obtain a portion of the landed estates as a grant from the crown, or in exchange for impropriated tithes. The alarm felt in the university

CHAP.  
V.

Matthew  
Parker.

1559-75.

Bonner's  
complaint  
of Cam-  
bridge.

Property  
of the  
University  
threat-  
ened.

\* See the preface, and statements to the same effect, Hooper's Works, ii. 268, 557, 567. Jewel, Works, i. 34, 60, ed. Park. Soc.

CHAP.  
V.

Matthew  
Parker.

1559-75.

Interview  
with  
Henry  
VIII.

was great, and the eyes of all were turned to Parker, who succeeded in having the commission issued to himself and to two other heads of houses. By the commissioners an inventory was made of all the possessions belonging to the colleges, together with the revenues and expenses of each. The commissioners then repaired to the court with a summary written on "a fair sheet of vellum." We possess an account, under the hand of Parker himself, of their interview with Henry VIII. at Hampton Court. The question related, not so much to the enriching of the king himself, as to that of his courtiers. Henry therefore could afford to be impartial. He was amused at seeing the latter discomfited, and he received the commissioners very graciously. His majesty carefully perused the statement. A man of business himself, he was pleased to see work done in a business-like manner. Turning to his courtiers, he observed, "that he thought he had not in his realm so many persons so honestly maintained in living by so little land and rent." He added, "pity it were these lands should be altered to make them worse." Parker shrewdly remarks, "at these words some were grieved, for they disappointed *lupos quosdam hiantes*." "In fine," he continues, "we sued to the king's majesty to be so gracious lord, that he would favour us in the continuance of our possessions such as they were; and that no man, by his grace's letters, should require to permute with us to give us worse. He made answer and smiled, that he could not but write for his servants and others doing the service of the realm in wars and other affairs; but he said he would put us to our choice, whether we would gratify them or no, and bade us hold our own, for, after writing, he would force us no further. With these words we were well armyd, and so departed."\*

\* This statement is in the handwriting of Archbishop Parker. C. C. C. Documents, 58, 60.

Thus, chiefly by the judicious management of Matthew Parker, the possessions of the colleges were preserved from the ravening wolves who had already devoured the lands and possessions of the religious houses throughout the kingdom.

Although Henry VIII. kept his word, and the lands of the university were not touched, the courtiers, nevertheless, had laid hands on many of those ecclesiastical preferments which had hitherto been regarded as the rewards of learning. The consequence was, as Latimer complained, the study of divinity had declined, and both universities were in a low condition. The counsellors of Edward VI. did not put a stop to the evil; we should say, rather, that they hungered and thirsted after the property of the Church with a greed quite equal to that which was displayed in his father's reign. The Duke of Somerset may be taken as an example. Reformer as he was, he held a deanery, a treasurer's stall, and three good prebends in a cathedral; his son had a pension of three hundred a year, nearly equivalent to three thousand according to the present value of money.

The townspeople, perceiving the weakness of the university, invaded its rights; and, by their unjustifiable encroachments, added to the difficulties by which the vice-chancellor was surrounded. On the death of Henry VIII. the affairs both of Church and State became more perplexed, and then it was that, as before stated, Dr. Parker was again elected vice-chancellor. He thus became a reformer of the university before he was called upon to engage in the reformation of the Church.

Soon after the accession of Edward VI., Parker carried a petition to be presented to the Lord Protector, calling upon the government to protect the university from the aggressions of the town. Although the commission

CHAP.

V.

Matthew  
Parker.

1559-75.

Re-elected  
vice-  
chancellor.  
1547-8.



CHAP.  
V.

Matthew  
Parker.

1559-75.

thereupon appointed did not immediately succeed in the reconciliation of the two corporations, the articles then drawn up formed the groundwork of the charter which Parker succeeded in obtaining in the reign of Queen Elizabeth.

Visitation  
of Cam-  
bridge.  
1549.

As regards the university, at Parker's suggestion a commission was appointed, which held its visitation in 1549. The interval between the issue of the commission and the holding of the visitation was employed in drawing up a body of statutes for the future government of the university. To Parker, who was vice-chancellor in 1548, may be attributed the reform in the examinations of the university which was promulgated in 1549.\* They were read by Sir John Cheke to the senate on May 6, 1549, and were then delivered to the vice-chancellor. In labouring for the reform of the university, Parker had efficient fellow-labourers in Roger Ascham, Smith, Cheke, Cecil, and Bacon, who, though his inferiors in point of standing, were admitted to his intimacy and friendship. He was certainly contented with his lot, and was not ambitious of any higher position in the Church. Cranmer, Ridley, and Latimer desired to employ his talents in a more extended sphere of action; but he determined to remain satisfied with the position achieved by his merits, moral and intellectual, in Cambridge.

In accepting the prebend of Corringham, in the church of Lincoln, to the deanery of which cathedral he was soon after advanced, Parker sought chiefly an increase of income; but his attachment to Bene't College induced him to refuse the mastership of Trinity College, and, at the same time, he declined a bishopric.

His happy home was broken up on the accession of Queen Mary. As a married man he was deprived of all

\* Statuta Regis Edwardi Sexti, 122.

his preferments, but he does not appear to have been harshly treated. He was permitted to nominate his successor; but, either by his own choice or on compulsion, he now quitted Cambridge.

The events of Parker's life during this time of trial must, however, be reserved for a separate chapter.

CHAP.

V.

Matthew  
Parker.

1559-75.

## CHAPTER VI.

## PARKER AS A STUDENT AND DIVINE.

Parker's early opinions.—Lutheranism at Cambridge.—Thomas Bilney.—The Anabaptists.—Dr. Barnes and the White House.—Martin Bucer.—Parker preaches his funeral sermon.—Scholasticism and the Schoolmen.—Parker's patristic studies.—The four great councils.—The English reformers.—Catholics and Protestants.

CHAP.  
VI.

Matthew  
Parker.  
1559-75.

THE history of Parker, as a student and divine, is reserved for a separate chapter. To a biographer, desirous of obtaining an insight into his character, the subject here treated of is one of considerable importance. Its importance is increased when we bear in mind the influence of Parker in directing, to a satisfactory result, the reformation of the Church of England, as attempted in their different ways under Warham, Wolsey, and Cranmer. The reader, it is hoped, will not forget what was stated at some length in the introductory chapter of this book. He must be reminded that the reformation of our Church did not consist of one revolutionary act, but that it was a series of events extending over at least a century and a half, which was capable of being at one time retarded, at another resumed, according to circumstances, and which was in some measure dependent upon the ascendancy or depression of rival factions.

Had the religious movement of the sixteenth century in England related to the establishment of a sect, whether Romish or Protestant, the violation of a principle would have been speedily detected and easily remedied; but

CHAP.

VI.

Matthew  
Parker.

1559-75.

Parker's  
theological  
opinions  
as a young  
man.

when a Church was to be reformed, it was more easy to detect the existence of errors than to remove them, and care had to be taken lest the introduction of new opinions should interfere with the principles to which the people were attached, and of the truth of which no doubt existed.

Nothing could be further from the fact, than the supposition encouraged by the evil-disposed, and accepted unquestioned by ignorance, that Matthew Parker went up to Cambridge a Protestant, determined to carry out Protestantism as it is now stereotyped for the use of speakers in Exeter Hall. The anti-Papal spirit, which had existed through many generations, had become a national passion long before the time of Parker's matriculation in 1521-2; but, as a learned historian remarks, as late as the year 1534 the Reformation, so far as doctrine was concerned, had scarcely dawned in this country. By those who were leading the attack upon Rome, no intention was entertained of proceeding further in this direction, than to remove the abuses that were more or less directly connected with the Papal supremacy. A few chronological outlines may, therefore, be of service, and the chief dates assigned to the events occurring between the matriculation of Parker in 1521-2 and the death of Queen Mary in 1558, which is the real date of the beginning of Parker's career in the character of a reformer.

At the time of his arrival at Cambridge, he certainly could not have called himself a Protestant, for the name, if not the thing, did not at that time exist. The designation was not known, even in Germany, until the Diet of Spire, when, on the passing of the decree, at the suggestion of Charles V., for the purpose of supporting the peculiarities of the Church of Rome, six Lutheran princes and the deputies of thirteen imperial towns pro-

CHAP.  
VI.Matthew  
Parker.  
1559-75.

tested against it; and the Diet of Spire was not convened until the year 1529.

Parker was not likely to be called a Calvinist, for Calvin, having been born in 1509, was Parker's junior by a few years. The *Institutio Christianæ Religionis*, though composed in 1533, was not issued till 1535.\* Although the name of Luther must have been familiar to English ears in 1521, yet it is only from the time when Leo X. issued a grant of indulgences to be sold for money, that is to say, not until the year 1517, that Lutheranism can be dated.

Lutheran-  
ism at  
Cam-  
bridge.

At an early period of Parker's residence at Cambridge, some of Luther's works were clandestinely circulated; the inclination so often displayed, especially by the young, to act at some risk against authority, may have conduced to their circulation. Henry VIII.'s polemical zeal against Luther induced many young men to ascertain for themselves what it was that provoked the wrath of the king. Henry VIII., at this time, was so desirous of establishing his character as Defender of the Faith, that, as it was well known, he was urging Lewis of Bavaria to prove his orthodoxy by adopting measures in his dukedom for the extirpation of heresy. It was not till 1531, ten years after Parker's matriculation, that Henry VIII. succeeded in compelling the Catholic Church in this realm to declare the king to be, not only the head of all things in the State, but the supreme head also of the Church. Thirteen years were after this to elapse before Luther's Bible made its appearance. It was not until 1536, that the translation of the sacred volume into English by Tyndale

\* Calvin, says Archdeacon Hardwick, does not appear to have been generally known in England before the close of Henry's reign. Archbishop Laurence observes, that he could not ascertain when the word Calvinist first became general. Foxe does not use it.



and Coverdale was placed in the hands of the public. In 1537, the Archbishop of Canterbury, Dr. Cranmer, proved his adhesion to the dogma of transubstantiation by causing Lambert to be burnt for the denial of it. Six more years were to elapse before the first English Litany was used. It was not till the year 1547, that the first reformed Prayer Book made its appearance, being set to music by Marbeck in 1550.

CHAP.  
VI.  
Matthew  
Parker.  
1559-75.

In short, Parker had been thirty years at the University before the second revision of our Liturgical offices took place.

That Parker was present at Bilney's execution, at an early period of his university career, is certain ; but the question is, What kind of Protestant was little Thomas Bilney? We suspect that the frequenters of Exeter Hall will be astonished to hear of Bilney, who is claimed by Foxe as a Protestant martyr, that the same Foxe remarks,—"that, touching the mass and the sacrament of the altar, Thomas Bilney never varied or differed from the most grossest Catholics."

Thomas  
Bilney.

Bilney, like Pole in Italy, imagined that he could agree with Luther in holding the doctrine of justification by faith only, and hold it in consistency with the acceptance of sacramental doctrine. It was with a view of reconciling these two doctrines that Luther introduced his dogma of consubstantiation. But Bilney, on this point, did not go so far as Luther ; and we may presume that to his reputed orthodoxy on the subject of the sacraments, the kindness is to be attributed which was certainly evinced towards him by many who, on other grounds, were his opponents. Bilney was a vehement, enthusiastic, affectionate, and indiscreet man ; who was the more beloved by his friends from their conviction that he was always sincere, and that he required their aid to extricate



CHAP.  
VI.Matthew  
Parker.

1559-75.

him from difficulties into which he was hurried by the impulses of a mind not always in a condition of sanity. His violent tirades against "idolatry, invocation of saints, vain worship of images, false trust in men's merits, and such other points as seemed prejudicial and derogatory to the blood of our Saviour," exasperated the men of "the old learning," against whom the men of progress, though not always going so far as he did, determined to defend him. He did not argue, but he appealed to men's affections, and generally with success. This was certainly the case with respect to Matthew Parker, who exhibited in his conduct towards Bilney that mixture of generosity and caution, of moral courage and physical timidity, which became one of his characteristics. When Bilney had, through timidity and an appeal to his affectionate disposition, recanted before the Bishop of London, Dr. Tunstall, and was, on consideration, driven to the verge of despair, he found in Parker a kind and sympathizing friend, and, notwithstanding the disparity of their years, a wise adviser.

Present at  
Bilney's  
death.

When it was reported in Cambridge, that Bilney was prosecuted at Norwich as a relapsed heretic, Matthew Parker started immediately for his native place, that he might be at hand to render assistance, if Bilney stood in need of it. When he arrived at Norwich, he found Bilney committed to the custody of one of the sheriffs, who, without sharing his opinions, or, at all events, without approving of his manner of expressing them, was nevertheless his personal friend. If we put out of consideration the final act, Bilney could not complain of harsh treatment. Dr. Warner, Parson of Winterton, was in attendance upon him, received his confession, gave him absolution, and administered to him the Holy Communion.

Parker probably attended the mass on the occasion.

CHAP.  
VI.Matthew  
Parker.

1559-75.

As he went to execution, Bilney distributed alms among the people, conversed cheerfully with the bystanders, and spoke words of moderation and piety. It had been reported that the Mendicants had been active in his prosecution; and Bilney, at their request, acquitted them of any share in bringing him to judgment. Although adhering to all Catholic truth, he continued to the last to censure the corruption of the Church, through the ignorance, superstition, or avarice of the leading clergy of the day. We can easily understand how a person so situated could be misrepresented; and that, ignorant of the denunciations of Thomas Bilney, as pronounced on the evil practices of the Church, no less a person than Sir Thomas More, having heard that he held the doctrines of the Church as distinguished from the superstitions of its ministers, gave currency to the report that Bilney had again recanted. This statement, circulated to the detriment of his friend's character, Matthew Parker, at all times, indignantly denied.

Looking at the treatment experienced by Bilney from a theological standing point, it is as unaccountable as it was cruel. He held the doctrines of the Church as it then existed, with a few insignificant qualifications. But against the ministers and rulers of the Church he was so violent, that he was suspected of being an Anabaptist.

Parker was still a student at Cambridge when the Anabaptists made their appearance in England. A brief notice of them becomes necessary, because, by the alarm which they occasioned, they, without intending it, strengthened the hands of the English reformers, who, throughout their career, made a clear distinction between reform and revolution.

The origin of the Anabaptists of the sixteenth century is involved in obscurity. They appeared first in Saxony,

CHAP.  
VI.

Matthew  
Parker.

1559-75.

or in Switzerland; but it was not until they established themselves in Northern Germany that, by their peculiarities and eccentricities, they attracted general attention. Their conduct, based on the most absurd theories, would have led, except for the interposition of the civil power, to the entire disruption of civilized society. They contended that they had as much right as Luther, or any other of the foreign reformers, to place their own construction upon Holy Scripture, and to bend it to the support of their private judgment. According to their view of revealed truth, they insisted upon a community of goods and universal equality; not only tithes, but tribute in every form, together with all usury, were denounced as unscriptural; baptism of infants was in their opinion an invention of the devil; as all Christians had a right to teach, the appointment of ministers was condemned; Christ being King, no magistrates were needed; revelations were still made from God to man, through dreams and visions, vouchsafed to persons who regarded themselves as prophets.\*

At what time they first appeared in England is not exactly known; but in the remnant of Wiclifites and Lollards, and other discontented spirits, they met with an amount of sympathy which alarmed a suspicious government impatient of contradiction. Of these unhappy persons some were consigned to the stake in the reign of Edward VI., the reformers being the more exasperated

Anabap-  
tists  
burned in  
Edward  
VI.'s reign.

\* See Mosheim, book iv. sec. 3. part ii. ch. vi. § 1, ed. Stubbs. Maclaine says that "Bockholdt, or Bockelson, alias John of Leyden, who headed the Anabaptists at Münster, ran stark naked in the streets, married eleven wives at the same time, to show his approbation of polygamy, and entitled himself *King of Sion*." Fuesslin, in his *Beyträge*, iii. 119, denies that the Anabaptists in general advocated polygamy, or rejected the Divinity of our Lord. Mosheim's statement, however, is generally believed.

against them by their inability, without denying the right of private judgment, to convict them of error; and among the sufferers in the reign of Mary many were accused, with more or less justice, of holding these tenets. Traces of them occur as early as 1536; and in 1538, the year when Parker took his D.D. degree, a royal commission was issued against them.\* So great was the alarm with respect to these sectarians, that Hugh Latimer, when Bishop of Worcester, referred without compunction to the numerous Anabaptists who were, in the reign of Edward VI., burned in the different towns of England. He states that, though he did not witness the executions himself, he was credibly informed that they "went to their death even *intrepide*, as ye will say, without any fear in the world, cheerfully." He argued from their conduct, that it was no proof that a man had truth on his side, because, for the maintenance of his opinions, he was prepared to die: he concluded with saying, "well, let them go."†

Parker's conduct in standing by his friend Bilney, amidst the fires of persecution, contrasts favourably with the conduct of this illustrious Protestant martyr.‡

It is affirmed by Strype, that Parker, when a young man, was a disciple of Dr. Barnes; but he gives no authority for the statement; and, even admitting its correctness, it will not throw any light upon Parker's opinions at the time. The opinions of Dr. Barnes, when he presided at the meetings at the White House, did not differ much from the theological opinions of the Church.

\* Wilkins, iii. 856.

† Latimer, i. 160.

‡ It has been shown incidentally by Dr. Maitland, that nearly all who suffered in the days of Henry VIII. and Edward VI., and many, also, of the sufferers under Queen Mary, were prosecuted, because it was known, though it could not always be proved, that they held these socialistic opinions.

CHAP.  
VI.

Matthew  
Parker.

1559-75.

Dr. Barnes  
and the  
White  
House.  
1527.



CHAP.  
VI.  
Matthew  
Parker.  
1559-75.

Considerable latitude was allowed to speculation, provided there was no attempt to disturb the public peace. Parker, when he went to the University, was fully convinced, as all England was, that the Church required a radical reform. He was quite prepared to admit, that this implied a reconsideration of many doctrines and opinions which had hitherto been unquestioned. He never exhibited any tendency to oppose the authorities of Church or State; but he desired, under the influence of the spirit of the age, to make himself master of the controversies prevalent on the Continent, and now introduced into England. Although the White House was nicknamed Germany, and German books were clandestinely circulated, the meetings were not secret; nor were they disturbed until, by the violence of some of the speakers, a suspicion of Anabaptism was excited against the members. Cardinal Wolsey issued an order, that Lutheran books should be searched for and destroyed; but his treatment of Barnes showed that he could act with toleration. Barnes had made a personal attack on the great Cardinal, and ridiculed his golden shoes, his poleaxes, his pillars, and his crosses: when he was summoned before Wolsey, the Cardinal remarked, that he thought Barnes might find scope in the Scriptures to teach the people, without maligning him for accepting the forms and ceremonies pertaining to the high office to which he had been providentially called.

Dr. Barnes  
summoned  
before  
Wolsey.

Young Parker ran no risk, therefore, by attending the meetings at the White House, even if it be true that he attended the lectures of Dr. Barnes. As to Barnes' protestantism in 1527, he held the Romish doctrine of transubstantiation without hesitation; and such being the case, he was not likely, on doctrinal points, to become obnoxious to the ruling authorities.

It is sometimes stated that, for his theological views, Parker was much indebted to Martin Bucer; but this statement will hardly bear investigation. Martin Bucer arrived in England, and was appointed Professor of Divinity at Cambridge by the council of Edward VI., in the year 1549. Now Matthew Parker was at that time in the forty-sixth year of his age. He had devoted himself, as we shall presently see, to patristic studies for seven years; he had had considerable experience as a pastor; he was a dignitary of the Church; he was a royal chaplain; he was a doctor of Divinity, S.T.P.; he was master of Corpus Christi College; he had been twice elected vice-chancellor of the University of Cambridge; and, on the second occasion, so high was his repute, that the election was nearly unanimous. If we are to indulge in conjectures, the historian of Matthew Parker has as much right to suppose, that a person so qualified and so highly endowed would act in the character of Bucer's instructor, as the biographer of Bucer can be justified in making his hero the preceptor of Parker. If we pass from conjecture to fact, we do not find, so far as I am aware, that Parker ever applied for advice to Bucer; while we certainly can produce a letter from Bucer himself,\* in which he solicits an interview with Parker, in order that he might confer with him on the subject of the lectures, which the foreign professor was preparing to deliver to the English University. In writing his book, *De Regno Christi*, Bucer admitted, that he was deeply indebted to the opinions expressed in conversation by Dr. Parker, who also assisted the professor in a public disputation which he held in Cambridge with Dr. Yong.†

The intercourse between Parker and Bucer was very short, and was rendered shorter by the infirm state of

CHAP.  
VI.

Matthew  
Parker.  
1559-75.

Martin  
Bucer.  
1549.

\* Corresp. p. 41.

† Strype, i. 56.



CHAP.  
VI.

Matthew  
Parker.  
1559-75.

Bucer's health. Bucer arrived at Cambridge in 1550, and died on the 28th of February, 1551. To Parker, who had seen little, but had heard much of foreign divines, the arrival of Bucer caused much excitement. He learned to value him for his learning and his virtues; and, on several occasions, proved himself to be a useful friend. Of their friendly intercourse we have one or two instances; to which, trifling as they are, it is pleasant at this distance of time, we scarcely know why, to refer. In the letter in which Bucer says, that he will call at Bene't College to receive Dr. Parker's advice on the subject of his lectures, he accepts an invitation, for himself and his wife, to dine with Dr. and Mrs. Parker on the following Wednesday.\* Not long after, another invitation to dinner is sent to Bucer, and accepted conditionally, that he may take with him as his *umbra*, a German friend, who had just arrived from London. There is another letter, at the foot of which is a touching note in Parker's own hand: *Scriptum novissimum omnium quod scripsit D. Bucer paulo ante mortem ejus.*

The letter is so brief, that we may give it in the original:

"S. D. Oro. D. T. clarissime D. Doctor, ut des mihi x. coronatos mutuo, uno tamen mense reddam, bona fide. Opt. vale.

"D. T. deditiss. in Domino Martinus Bucerus  
tamen perægre scripsi.†

"Clariss. viro D.D. Matthæo Parkero, domino ac fratri  
in Christi charissimo."

During the short time of his residence at Cambridge, Bucer was a great sufferer in his bodily health. Writing to Brentius, in May, 1550, he tells his correspondent that, ever since August, he had suffered from severe illness, which left him in a state of weakness in his legs, arms,

\* Corresp. p. 41.

† Ibid. p. 42.

and hands. He seems to have been partially paralyzed, being unable to move one of his fingers in his left hand, and two in his right. He complains of severe pains in all his limbs, succeeded by the greatest weakness and prostration of strength ; \* also of the want of comfort and the prevalence of filth, and that he misses the German stove. † When wood was the chief fuel, and that fuel dear, our ancestors seldom indulged in a fire except in the great hall. “Think,” says Bucer, writing to the ministers at Strasburg, “what it must be for this frail body of mine, which has been, from my childhood, utterly unable to bear the cold, to be without a stove during the winter, which is occasionally most severe, and at all times injurious, and also to be without my usual wine and diet.” ‡ In addition to bodily suffering, Bucer, always a friend of peace, felt very deeply the misunderstandings which divided the anti-papists, and which rendered them weak, by splitting them into sects. His friendship with Peter Martyr, now located at Oxford, had been long and sincere. He deplored, therefore, their disagreement about the real presence in the Eucharist. It is difficult to decide what were Bucer’s real opinions on the subject, for he had acquired the evil habit of expressing himself, of set purpose, obscurely, with the object of creating an appearance of agreement when all the while he knew that, at the bottom, there was a vital difference.

If Bucer had any influence over Parker’s mind, he led him, no doubt, to the partial adoption of this unwise course. We shall see, hereafter, that Parker, contenting himself with securing the recognition of a fundamental verity, was sometimes careless in the mode of enunciating

CHAP.

VI.

Matthew  
Parker.

1559-75.

\* Zurich Letters, ii. 544.

† Edward VI. presented him with a German stove.

‡ Zurich Letters, ii. 550.

CHAP.  
VI.

Matthew  
Parker.

1559-75.

it, that thus he might disarm immediate opposition, leaving the truth to be more firmly asserted, at a more convenient season. Parker came the more generously to Bucer's support, because he found him fiercely assailed by the Calvinistic party as it existed abroad, and was gradually forming itself in England.

John Burcher, writing to Bullinger, does not hesitate to say: "I am ignorant as to what the hireling Bucer, who fled from this church (Strasburg) before the wolf came in sight, is plotting in England. He is an invalid, and, as report says, is either becoming childish, or is almost in his dotage, which is the usual result of a wandering and inconstant mind." \*

A letter to the same effect, but more fiercely worded, from Hooper, may be produced.

There seems, nevertheless, to have been something peculiarly fascinating in "the pacific Bucer," as Ranke styles him. At the lodge of Corpus Christi College were frequently assembled, to discuss various subjects occupying the public mind, such men as Sandys, Grindal, and Bradford. Parker and his friends watched with anxiety the increasing weakness of Bucer, until at length he was unable to converse, and, welcoming Parker with a smile, employed the time in silent meditation. He said that his whole soul was fixed on Christ and Him crucified, that God was in his heart, that he was contemplating nothing but heaven, and a speedy departure from the body. † On the 28th of February, 1550-1, Martin Bucer died.

Martin  
Bucer dies.  
1550-1.

Parker and Haddon were appointed his executors. It was a great occasion, and Parker was distinguished as a preacher. The sermon was published in English in 1587. ‡

\* Zurich Letters, ii. 666.

† Bucer. Script. Ang. p. 874.

‡ "Howe wee ought to take the Death of the Godly," printed at London by Ingge; without date. The edition of Bucer's Scripta Anglicanum is dated 1577.

I have not been able to procure a copy, but there is a careful Latin translation in Bucer's works. Attestation was borne to Bucer's popularity, or to the popularity of the cause of which he was the representative, by the immense assemblage of all classes of persons when the funeral discourse was delivered. The university attended in full costume—the vice-chancellor, proctors, doctors, and graduates. This procession was joined by that of the mayor and corporation, and a large concourse of townsmen. Dr. Parker took his text from the Apocrypha, Wisdom iv. 7–19. He dwelt at considerable length on the fact, that the death of a true Christian is really a source, not of sorrow, but of joy. Survivors might indulge in grief at the contemplation of their loss, but their grief should not be immoderate. The loss of Bucer might be lamented. He had been a burning and a shining light, his very enemies admitting the sanctity of his daily life, and his diligence in the discharge of his professional duties. Bucer, it was said, was taken from the University as a judgment on their sins: the thought of which, and to escape heavier judgment, should urge them to more complete reformation. It will be seen that there is nothing very remarkable in the sermon; but Parker enlarged upon the topic with copious references to Scripture, and he concluded with a peroration of much force and eloquence. Then followed the bidding prayers—an *exhortatio ad preces* of the Catholic Church for all wanderers from the one and only fold; for the Churches of England and Ireland; for King Edward VI.; for all relatives who had departed this life; for themselves, that they might be admitted with patriarchs and saints to the beatific vision, inter quos vobis numero hunc præstantem et reverendum patrem D. Martinum Bucerum, pro quo fideliter gratias agamus Deo, quod in Sanctitate requiem suam inciperit. Silent prayers were then offered.

CHAP.  
VI.

Matthew  
Parker.  
1559–75.

Parker's  
funeral  
sermon.



CHAP.  
VI.Matthew  
Parker.

1559-75.

The reader has now before him a slight view of the difficulties with which Parker had to contend in his desire to arrive at the truth, and the very little help he received. Although he was a man of strong mind and sterling common sense, with business habits and great powers of application, he was not a man of genius; and the manner in which he gradually acquired knowledge, strengthened his convictions and distinguished nicely between the less marked lines which separate truth from error, may lead us to perceive, that the moral faculties of a resolute mind may so far raise the possessor of it, as to enable him to direct and control many who, in the struggle of life, are in intellectual power his superiors.

Learning, especially as it existed in the universities, was in a transition state when Parker first engaged in the conduct of its affairs. More attention was paid to the old scholastic system than was the case when his friends and disciples, Smith and Cheke, rose to power. To their master and harbinger these distinguished scholars were much indebted. Though beginning where his academical labours had ended, they worked under advantages not possessed by him. Instead of stating that a new learning had begun, we should be more correct in saying, that the old learning had merged into the new. To the present hour the effects of the scholastic system has its influence on European learning. As the old trivium and quadrivium in the schools had merged into scholasticism, so scholasticism has merged into modern philosophy. It is discreditable to many pretenders to learning, and even more so to some really learned men, when they venture to speak with contempt of men, their equals certainly—perhaps their superiors—in vigour of mind and in moral excellence, merely because the conclusions at which the latter have arrived, or their manner of investigating a common subject,

Scholasti-  
cism.

may differ from the principles which their self-constituted censors assert to be indisputable. This conduct becomes an act of dishonesty, when these intellectual inquisitors admit that they have never studied the works upon which they presume to sit in judgment and to pass sentence. Such a treatment, until of late years, the Schoolmen have received at the hands of modern philosophers. Men of learning, or—as in the last century, the title then implied—philologists, deeply read in the classics, and despising as barbarian whatever did not accord with the literature and philosophy of Greece and Rome, introduced that mode of speaking disparagingly of scholasticism which has been imitated by the *petit littérateur* of our own age. From the deference, however, which is now evinced to German literature, we may expect to find the subject of scholasticism once more fearlessly discussed, its faults fairly exposed, but its merits duly admitted. It is said by Semler: “The poor scholastici have been too much despised, and that, frequently, by people who would not be good enough to be their transcribers.” Ullman calls the scholastic theology, “in its commencement, a truly scientific advance upon the past; in its entire course, a great dialectic preparatory school of Christianity in the West; in its completion, a grand and highly finished production of the human mind.”\* These writers are advanced Protestants, men of the Rationalistic or Unitarian school. To their testimony we may add the opinion of Sir James Mackintosh, when, in his “Progress of Ethical Philosophy,” he has occasion to speak of Thomas Aquinas. His panegyric is qualified, but his qualification will, in the opinion of the readers of these pages, add to the merit of the *Summa Theologiæ*. The ethical system of the School-

CHAP.  
VI.

Matthew  
Parker.

1559-75.

\* I give these quotations from Hagenbach, whose own opinion accords with those of the writers to whom he refers.



CHAP.  
VI.Matthew  
Parker.

1559-75.

men, or, to speak more properly, of Aquinas as the master of Christendom for three centuries, was in its practical part so excellent as to leave little need of extensive change, with the inevitable exception of the connection of his religious opinions with his precepts and counsels. His rule is neither lax nor impracticable; his grounds of duty are solely laid in the nature of man and in the well-being of society. Such an intruder as subtlety seldom strays into his moral instructions. With a most imperfect knowledge of the peripatetic writings, he came near the great master by abstaining, in practical philosophy, from the unsuitable exercise of that faculty of distinction, in which he would probably have shown that he was little inferior to Aristotle if he had been equally unrestrained. His very frequent coincidence with modern moralists is, doubtless, to be ascribed chiefly to the nature of the subject; but in part also to that unbroken succession of teachers and writers which preserves the observations contained in what had been long the text-book of the European schools, after the books themselves had been for ages banished and forgotten. The praises bestowed on Aquinas by every one of the few great men who appear to have examined his writings since the downfall of his power, among whom may be mentioned Erasmus, Grotius, and Leibnitz, are chiefly, though not solely, referable to his ethical works.”\*

After rendering the honour which is their due to the great philosophers of the middle ages, we are not guilty of any inconsistency if we remark that, long before the beginning of the sixteenth century, it was perceived and acknowledged that, out of scholasticism, a new and a better system was rising. Scholasticism had begun in the

\* Mackintosh's *Ethical Philosophy*, ed. Whewell, p. 105. See also the excellent preface of Leibnitz to Nizolius, sec. 37.

schools founded by Charles the Great, with the noble object in view of effecting an alliance between revelation and reason. Theology supplied the dogma from Scripture, and the aim of philosophy was to penetrate the principles of revealed truth, and to establish their objective certainty. If the conclusions of the philosopher were not in accordance with the declarations of Scripture, it was modestly assumed that the philosopher was in error, and he resumed his investigations. In philosophical investigations the means employed were logic and metaphysics, or dialectics.

CHAP.  
VI.  
Matthew  
Parker.  
1559-75.

Scholasticism, in the first period of its history, may be described as the application of dialectics to theology; and this period may be considered as extending from Lanfranc and Anselm to John Scotus. The astonishing intellectual powers of John Scotus the Irishman accomplished less than might have been expected, because he laboured under the suspicion or charge of heresy. In Anselm's *Cur Deus Homo*, of which some notice has been taken in the life of that distinguished primate, we have a fair specimen of the services which have been rendered to religion by the scholastic philosophy. The scheme of satisfaction on which he speculated so largely, is the foundation of the theological system of those sects which, at the present time, assume to themselves the title of evangelical.

A.D.  
1010-1110.

Against the restraints which theology had imposed upon its speculations, the European mind, when thoroughly awakened, was prepared to rebel. The philosophy which at first professed to be only the *ancilla theologiæ*, now regarded theology and philosophy as standing upon an equality. The Nominalists, in the eleventh century, commenced their interminable warfare against that realism which had, till then, been taken for granted. Between

A.D. 1200.

CHAP.

VI.

Matthew  
Parker.

1559-75.

the two parties—the Realists and the Nominalists—who agreed that the essential object of dialectics was the discussion of *universals*, as distinguished from particular and individual things, the question arose, whether universals are words and names only, or things and real essences. It was by John Roscelin that the Nominalists were first formed into a sect. They found in Peter Abelard a zealous supporter; in talent, learning, and fame transcending his leader. Some of their conclusions, however, leading palpably to heresy, the Nominalists were condemned by the Church; and realism regained an ascendancy which it retained to the thirteenth century. Fresh energy was, at this time, infused into the schools of philosophy by a revival of the study of Aristotle. Although we have neither time nor space to recount the circumstances under which this revival took place, we must remark, in passing, that the Aristotelian philosophy was received by the Schoolmen, not from “the mighty Stagyrte” himself, but as diluted through Arabian translators and commentators. In the reforms of the thirteenth century, our countryman, Alexander de Hales, took the lead. By Albertus Magnus he was surpassed in learning; but even to him he did not yield in point of natural ability or genius. In learning and in genius, however, both of these distinguished men were inferior to Thomas Aquinas, the *Doctor universalis et angelicus*, of whom we have already spoken at some length. The *Summa Theologiae* remained for many years the text-book of the schools of Western Christendom. Against the Thomists, as his representatives were called, war was incessantly waged by the Scotists, who had for their founder Duns Scotus, another Englishman, a native of Northumberland. Although by those who have studied his works, Duns Scotus is represented as a deeply learned philosopher, yet, from the vain and idle distinctions in which he indulges,

A.D. 1250.

he appears to those who regard him only as a controversialist, as one who in his attack upon Aquinas had less regard for truth than a logical triumph. In the long war waged by the Scotists against the Thomists, although much subtle disputation was displayed on both sides, yet the result was an *odium theologicum* very damaging to the Christian character and cause. During these violent disputes, nominalism continued to gain ground, until it came to a climax under the leading of another Englishman, William of Occam, or Ockham, in Surrey. He was a disciple of Scotus, and achieved the title of *Doctor singularis, invincibilis et venerabilis Inceptor*. Without hesitation William of Occam set aside the dogmas of the Church whenever they interfered with his private judgment, or appeared to be inconsistent with his philosophical speculations. Notwithstanding this, his arguments and influence led to important practical results. By him the rights of the Gallican Church were openly and vigorously defended from the usurpations of the Pope. To his school, moreover, those great men attached themselves, of whose conduct at the Councils of Pisa, Constance, and Basle we have, in preceding chapters, spoken at some length. Thus scholasticism wore itself out, and was merged into the modern philosophy, for which it prepared the way.

The Scholastics employed dialectics as their weapon of offence and attack; and by degrees, in their schools, religion was too often turned into a mere matter of idle dispute. How jejune all this appeared to souls which were hungering and thirsting after righteousness, it is easy to understand. It was not head-work, but heart-work, for which the rising generation sighed; and it too often happened that, when the demand was made for bread, they received a stone. Hence, concurrently with the decline

CHAP.  
VI.

Matthew  
Parker.

1559-75.

A.D.  
1300-1400.



CHAP.  
VI.Matthew  
Parker.

1559-75.

of scholasticism, undermining rather than attacking it, mysticism made its appearance. By the Mystics, logic was subordinated to sentiment, and they contended that the intuitions of a true believer led to a knowledge of religion superior to anything attainable by dialectics. While dialectic theology was regarded by one party as the pinnacle of wisdom, so by the opposite party, in devotional feeling and contemplative lore, all true religion was supposed to consist.

Although this system would, in common minds, not unfrequently degenerate into fanaticism, or develop itself into heresy, there were, nevertheless, great men among the religious Mystics who anticipated the Reformation of the sixteenth century; and, while encouraging devotional fervour, and sensible communion with God, neither neglected to cultivate the understanding, nor evinced any disregard of the fundamental doctrines of the Christian Church.

They argued with the Schoolmen; they worshipped with the Mystics. Such were John Tauler—some of whose writings were, in after times, attributed to Luther—Gerson of Rheims, and Peter d'Ailley, of whom we have read in former volumes of this work, and pre-eminently Thomas Hamerken of Kempen, better known as Thomas à Kempis.\*

\* "The ideas of the orthodox Mystics rest on the positive foundation of the Creed; and all the spiritual transactions described by them are most intimately connected with the doctrine of the Trinity, the incarnation of Christ, the influence of the Spirit promised by Christ, and the mystery of the Lord's Supper. The abstract theory of the heretical Mystics seeks to fathom the depth of the soul, which, in their opinion, is nothing but God himself. They teach that sanctification is the work of man himself; and regard the said positive doctrines as, at most, the symbols of those spiritual transactions on which the accomplishment of the design of our life depends. It is of special importance, in an exposition of the history of this period, distinctly to separate these two kinds of orthodox and heterodox Mystics." Engelhardt, Richard von S. Victor,



Enough has been already advanced to account for the decline of scholasticism, at one time so universally popular. Everything in nature, or connected with man, has in it, from its beginning, or birth, the seeds of decay. In addition to the internal elements of decay in the scholastic system already noticed, political events had been long tending to shake its dominion over the minds of men. The Crusades, which opened a communication with the East, and made the Latin Church acquainted with the Arabic translations of Aristotle, and their commentaries—the invention of the art of printing—the conquest of Constantinople, which inflamed the Western world with a love of ancient literature, and placed the genuine, unadulterated works of Aristotle in the hands of the learned—the formation of a middle class of citizens—the development of modern languages—the firmer establishment of the civil power, and its increasing independence of Rome—the advancement of experimental knowledge of the sciences—the better taste introduced by the study of the classics—the detection that the Latin Vulgate, which, like our authorized version, had been too often made to stand in the place of the original text, required complete revision,—all conduced to the gradual formation of a public opinion, that the foundations of philosophy, as well as of theology, demanded re-examination, and that every school of thought must be subjected to a careful reform.

CHAP.  
VI.  
Matthew  
Parker.  
1559-75.

p. 2, quoted by Hagenbach, *Hist. Doct.* p. 413. In Hagenbach, Tenneman, and Gieseler we have an account of the Schoolmen and their systems. They refer to German writers who have written the history of these philosophers and divines. I am not aware of any English writer who has attempted this interesting subject. It is touched upon by Mr. Maurice in an article in the *Encyclopædia Metropolitana*, in reading which regret is felt that his powerful mind had not been directed entirely to this investigation. Bishop Hampden just enters on the subject, but stops short.

CHAP.  
VI.

Matthew  
Parker.

1559-75.

When the philosophy, on which the education in the Universities was based, was in a transitional state, the reform of the Universities became necessary. The young mind requires dogma for its basis of thought; and confusion was sure to ensue, when, ceasing to dogmatize, every youth was left to think out the most complicated subjects for himself, and without assistance. Although, as it has been before remarked, the obsolete system did a good work in the exercise of the mind, yet complaint was justly made, that the studies of the Universities had not risen to the intellectual requirements of the age. There was said to be no end of quoting and answering, of laying down theses and antitheses, of arguments and counter-arguments, of divisions and subdivisions, which seemed to be interminable. Complaint was made that the youth of the day were taught to argue, not for truth, but for victory; and, consequently, objections were multiplied that answers might be supplied. Heretical positions were not unfrequently advanced by the orthodox believer, and the unbeliever would offer himself in sarcastic mockery, with a sneer on his countenance, as a *malleus hæreticorum*. In short, as Erasmus observes, "there were innumerable quibblings about notions, and relations, and formalities, and quiddities, and hæcceities, which no eye could follow out but that of a lynx, which is said to be able, in the thickest darkness, to see things that have no existence." \*

A.D. 1525.  
Patristic  
studies.

When, in the year 1525, Parker was emancipated from college discipline, and was at liberty to pursue his own course of reading, he devoted himself, for seven years, to the study of the Fathers. Whether this course of study was the suggestion of his own mind, or whether he acted

\* Erasmi, *Stultitiæ Laus*, p. 141.

upon the advice of others, the plan adopted rendered him independent of modern authorities, and he grew up

Nullius addictus jurare in verba magistri.

CHAP.

VI.

Matthew  
Parker.

1559-75.

When, in process of time, the followers of Luther, or of Calvin, appeared in England, and sought to overthrow the foundations of the Church, that on its ruins they might erect a Protestant sect, Parker was willing to hear, and duly to consider, what good and learned men, whether his compatriots or foreigners, had to say; but their conclusions were not authoritative to him. He rather, by an appeal to the Fathers, acted towards them as a judge: he might read their writings; but it was in the spirit, not of a disciple, but a critic.

The Fathers were not to him as they are to the Romanist, when the Romanists attribute to them the same kind of inspiration as was vouchsafed to the Apostles: they were to him as witnesses—as persons qualified to bear testimony to the dogmas universally received by apostolic Churches. The Apostles preached before they wrote, and the primitive bishops sat at their feet, antecedently to the reception of the Epistles, or even of the Gospels. Of the apostolic teaching a record was kept; and if in one church a dogma was disputed, a correspondence between several Churches took place, to ascertain what each and all had received from the beginning.\* Our English reformers, as distinguished from the continental controversialists, believed that in the primitive Church there had been, from the beginning, a *traditio ex-egetica*, called by Irenæus the *κανὼν τῆς ἀληθείας*,† by

\* Routh, *Opuscula*, p. 690. See also St. Cyprian, Ep. 55, where he says, that the bishops, over the face of the whole world, acted together in one harmonious concert.

† Adv. Hæres. lib. i. cap. 9. sec. 4. See the whole subject admirably treated by Irenæus. *Regula Fidei*, ed. Routh, p. 690.

CHAP.  
VI.Matthew  
Parker.

1559-75.

Clemens Alexandrinus the *κανὼν ἐκκλησιαστικός*.<sup>\*</sup> The whole of Tertullian's book, *De Præscriptione*,<sup>†</sup> is an application of this principle to the controversies of his age. The principle of deference to the *traditio exegetica* was what distinguished the Catholic from the Heretic; the man who, in the interpretation of Scripture, had respect to the dogma of the Church, and the man who, however ignorant he might be, relied exclusively on his private judgment.<sup>‡</sup> That, through a constant intercourse between churches the most distant, a harmony of doctrine existed, such as prevails, at the present time, between different branches of the same sect, is expressly affirmed by Irenæus,<sup>§</sup> by Tertullian,<sup>||</sup> by Hegeſippus,<sup>¶</sup> by Clemens Alexandrinus,<sup>\*\*</sup> and by Origen.<sup>††</sup> The whole Church was organized for the purpose of ascertaining and preserving the *quod semper, quod ubique, quod ab omnibus*.

Matthew Parker devoted his attention to these early writers. He knew, what few would deny, that, to preserve the faith first orally delivered by apostolic preachers of the Church, a constant intercourse and correspondence were sustained between the bishops located in all parts of the world. Irenæus informs us that, even in his time, there were churches in Germany, in Spain, and in France, as well as in the East, in Egypt, in Africa, and in the middle of the world, in which one and the same tradition was preserved. He found many such letters in Eusebius, and he knew the care that was taken to prevent interpolation and forgery, and, by the employment

\* Strom. lib. vi. c. 15.

† See especially *De Præscript.* xxii. xxvii.

‡ This is well stated by Vincentius Lirinensis, cap. 34.

§ Lib. i. c. 10, alias 3; lib. iii. c. 3.

|| *De Præscript.* xx. xxviii.

¶ Apud Euseb. iv. 22.

\*\* Strom. lib. vii. 898, 899. Conf. Strom. i. 322.

†† In Apolog. Pamph. inter opp. Hierom. tom. v. 223.



of trustworthy messengers, to secure the delivery of the letters. They were called *literæ formatae*, because they were written in a peculiar form, with some peculiar marks or characters, which served as private signatures to distinguish the true from the counterfeit. Optatus remarks, that the whole world was united in one common society or communion, by the mutual intercourse of these canonical letters.\* “Is it possible,” Tertullian asks, “to suppose *that so many and such* great Churches have blundered into one and the same faith?”† It is from the existence of this principle in the primitive Church that the first four councils have obtained an authority which no subsequent councils have ever possessed. By refusing to take part in the Council of Trent, it was on this ground that Parker and the English reformers defended their orthodoxy. The Council of Trent, as was the case with the councils of the middle ages, was convened to define the faith according to the private judgment of the persons composing the assembly. It was with a very different object in view that the first four councils were summoned. The question then asked had not reference to the private opinions of the Fathers, but simply, as was the case with the *literæ formatae*, to ascertain with greater precision what the truths were which had been handed down from father to son. The Council of Nice had special reference to the doctrine of the Holy Trinity. The Fathers of the Nicene Council were very careful to declare, that the form of faith promulgated by them was no invention or deduction of their own, but simply what they had received when first they were instructed in the principles of Christianity.‡ The Novatian bishop, Acesius, himself

CHAP.  
VI.

Matthew  
Parker.

1559-75.

\* Lib. ii. 48.

† De Præscript. Hær. xxviii.: “Ecquid verisimile est ut tot ac tantæ in unam fidem erraverint?”

‡ Soc. lib. i. c. 8.



CHAP.  
VI.

Matthew  
Parker.

1559-75.

admitted to Constantine, that it was no new thing that at that time was decided upon. He affirmed that the council had decided according to tradition; and this was probably the reason why, at the commencement of the sessions, when the logicians began to discuss and dispute, they were immediately put to silence. The fact is clearly stated by Eusebius in a letter which he wrote to his diocese on the occasion: "As we have received by tradition from our predecessors, from our predecessors the bishops, then when we were instructed in the first principles of the faith, and received our baptism as we have learned from the sacred Scriptures, as also we do now believe, and do make a public declaration of our faith." \*

The very contest about the word *ὁμοούσιον* may be traced to the misapplication of this principle. It was thought by some to be a new term; and so it was, but it was employed to express the fact universally acknowledged. It is easy to show that, in the three other councils, the design, object, and intention were the same. We are not concerned with the character or the opinions of those who were summoned to the council. It was for the purpose of preventing the introduction of novelties, and of reporting that which was received from the beginning, that these councils were convoked. The members, while they solemnly disclaimed any design of adding to the faith, solemnly professed their resolution to follow the steps of the Fathers.†

In making this assertion, it is not intended to affirm or insinuate that no discussions took place; for there were many points, namely, those which related to the regulation of different churches, which were open to, and indeed

\* Soc. lib. i. c. 8.

† Πάντες οἱ εὐλαβέστατοι ἐβόησαν Δικαία ἡ κρίσις τῶν πατέρων.  
Canones Chalcedonensis. Concil. Univ. p. 419.

called for, discussion. It is only contended that these discussions did not take place when articles of the faith were under consideration. To make this distinction is a matter of great importance, and nothing can tend more strongly to prove its existence than the difference in the form of words used when any canon pertaining merely to a rite or ceremony, or to a case of discipline, was enacted, from the course adopted when assent was given to an article of faith. In the former case the form was *ἐδοξεν ταῦτα ὑποτεταγμένα* (these things seem good to us), in the latter *οὕτως πιστεύει ἡ καθολικὴ ἐκκλησία* (so the Catholic Church believes); not presuming to act on their own judgment, but simply declaring the fact of tradition.\*

CHAP.  
VI.  
Matthew  
Parker.  
1559-75.

Such were the principles of the English reformers, and well would it have been for the Church of England if to those principles they had consistently adhered. In their weakness they frequently yielded to the clamours of the ultra-Protestants, and became involved in perplexities, from which even now we find it difficult to escape. Parker, and those who coincided with him—that is to say, those who, in seeking the reformation of the Church, acted on the principle now laid down—regarded themselves, as indeed they were, as persons baptized into, representing, and called upon to govern the old Catholic Church of this realm; this—the old Catholic Church—they never quitted. That, in the middle ages, corruptions, both in discipline and doctrine, had gradually been introduced by the negligence of our ecclesiastics at home,

Principles  
of the  
English  
reformers.

\* Athanasius, *De Syn.*, quoted by Hammond in his *Parænesis*, p. 558. Hammond continues: "To which purpose also was, I suppose, the second versicle in the doxology (the orthodoxal form of acknowledging the Trinity), '*As it was in the beginning,*' as it stood by original tradition apostolical, '*is now, and ever shall be, world without end.*'" No new doctrine was ever to be brought into the Church, by whatsoever council, but only that which the Apostles had delivered.

CHAP.  
VI.Matthew  
Parker.

1559-75.

and the gradual, but incessant, usurpations of the myrmidons of Popery, they were so far from denying, that they felt it their duty to emancipate their Church from the foreign thralldom, and to bring it back from mediæval romance to primitive truth. Unfortunately, they were, or imagined themselves to be, too weak to effect this, without recourse to an alliance with another power, and they soon found a new tyrant in the sovereign whom they first accepted as an ally.

They seem never to have forgotten their position, which was strictly that of reformers. It has been elsewhere observed that Luther, Zwingli, and Calvin were not, properly speaking, reformers; they were merely leaders of a great revolution. A reformation supposes the pre-existence of something to be reformed—the old Catholic Church. That Church they regarded as Naaman, captain of the host of the king of Syria, had been regarded by the prophet of the Lord. Naaman was a mighty man in valour, *but* he was a leper. The Church had been leprous. In order to wash it, the Romanists at Trent boasted of their Abana and Pharpar; our English reformers would cleanse it by the waters of Jordan; the foreign reformers, though they preferred the waters of the Jordan, would have destroyed the man, and arrayed a new creature of their own fabrication in the splendid garments with which, in the spirit of Gehazi, they would have decorated him.

Ecclesiastical events are, from this time, liable to be confused in the mind of a general reader, from the want of a clear definition of terms and titles. Men use, very frequently, one and the same term to express very different ideas. We may mention such words as *regeneration* with reference to one sacrament, and the *real presence* with respect to the other. So, again, with respect to titles.

Who, for example, are the Catholics? That title, the English reformers could not give to the Romanists, because it would imply that the English reformers were heretics. A heretic, as we have before seen, means, in the vocabulary of the primitive Church, a man who, instead of deferring to the tradition of the Church, interpreted the Bible according to his own private judgment; and, as we have already seen, and shall have occasion hereafter to show, from the writings of Bishop Jewel, it was by an appeal to primitive tradition that our reformers silenced the Romanists.

CHAP.  
VI.  
Matthew  
Parker.  
1559-75.  
Catholics.

Then, again, who are the Protestants? At the early portion of the Reformation period, Protestant and Lutheran were convertible terms, and Protestants, holding the doctrine of consubstantiation, were opposed in language most bitter by the Zwinglians and Calvinists. The confusion to which we have alluded is occasioned by readers applying to the Reformation period the ideas entertained in the nineteenth century on these and similar subjects. They divide the religionists of England into two parties, distinguished from each other by a line clearly defined. Catholics—by whom they mean Romanists—and Protestants, including all who are opposed to the Church of Rome, descending even to Unitarians, to whom the name of Protestant, in strict propriety, should be confined, for they carry the rights of private judgment to its extreme point, and protest, in many cases, not only against Romanism, but against fundamental tenets of Christianity itself, leaving us a Christianity without a Christ.

Protest-  
ants.

It is important to observe that, for many years after the Reformation in England, there was no Romish sect in this country; and indeed it is only within a few years that the Romanists gave to their sect, by the introduction



CHAP.  
VI.Matthew  
Parker.

1559-75.

of a schismatical hierarchy, the appearance of a Church in rivalry to the old Catholic Church which our ancestors reformed. "Our forefathers had," says the learned Bishop Sanderson, "no purpose, nor had they any warrant to set up a new religion, but to reform the old by purging it of those innovations which, in the tract of time, some sooner, some later, had mingled with it and corrupted it, both in doctrine and worship." This, we have to repeat, was the position occupied by the English reformers. In the time of Parker, although this was their principle, they permitted the title of Protestant to be imposed upon them. In narrating Parker's history, we shall adopt the term, but with this explanation,—that the term Protestant, though still confined to the Lutherans abroad, was not so employed in England. On the Continent the custom was, and in many places still is, to divide the dissentients from Rome into two great classes,—the Protestants and the Reformed; the Reformed meaning the sects which, whatever their present tenets, originated in Calvinism. In Parker's time, the word Protestant was understood to denote the Reformed Church of England, or the Anglo-Catholic Church. Opposed to the English reformers stood the Puritans, the representatives of Calvinism. We will here repeat what has been said. There were the Anglo-Catholics, who, except when in controversy they were obliged to come to precise terms, were content to be called Protestants. There were the Puritans, in whom we find the germ of what has since been called "Evangelicalism." Soon after the first decade of Elizabeth's reign there was the Romish sect—pure sectarians, without any hierarchy, representing, not the primitive Church, but the existing Roman government. The English reformers, unwisely—for all insincerity is unwise—were the more willing to accept the designation of



Protestants, as it enabled them the better to make common cause with parties on the Continent opposed to Romanism. This involved them in many inconsistencies, and strengthened the hands of the Puritans by enabling them to appeal, in their various disputes, to the public opinion of continental sects. It was productive of another great evil, by weakening the Church at home. When they assumed the name of Protestants, there was a large party, who, accusing the English reformers of being false to Protestant principles, set up independent and rival places of worship. Others, desiring to obtain a share in the emoluments of an endowed Church, conformed with great discontent, their avowed object being to transmute the old Catholic Church into a mere Protestant sect. This party, which, without intending it, strengthened the Romish cause, has always been the weakness of the Church of England, and created most of those difficulties, to contend with which was the business of Parker's life throughout his archiepiscopate.

CHAP.

VI.

Matthew  
Parker.

1559-75.

## CHAPTER VII.

## PARKER AS A PASTOR AND PREACHER.

Parker returns to Norwich.—Is licensed to preach.—Becomes chaplain to Anne Boleyn, and Dean of Stoke.—Appointed chaplain to Henry VIII.—The deanery of Stoke.—Reforms of 1536-43.—Statute of Six Articles.—Presented to the living of Asben.—Prebendary of Ely.—Rector of Burlingham.—Of Landbeach.—Is accused of heresy.—Dr. Stokes.—Dissolution of Stoke.—Parker is appointed Dean of Lincoln.—Marries Margaret Harleston.—Reforms of 1547 and 1549.—Summoned to preach at Paul's Cross.—Disturbances of 1549.—Rising in the West.—Kett's insurrection.—Parker during the reign of Mary.—His accident.—View of his character.

CHAP.  
VII.Matthew  
Parker.

1559-75.

IN the preceding chapters, attention has been chiefly directed to the academical life of Parker, and to his studies as a divine; we have reserved for a separate chapter a description of his character as a pastor and preacher. In treating of him in this character, it will be necessary occasionally to retrace our steps, for much of what is about to be related occurred contemporaneously, or nearly so, with circumstances already described. It was providentially ordered that the future reformer should be trained for his great work practically, as well as theoretically. He learned that in dealing with men we must, while aiming at the highest excellence, be contented sometimes with what the selfishness of friends, or the malignity of opponents, can be allowed or compelled to grant. Having commenced a good work, it becomes sometimes necessary, with whatever amount of reluctance

or misrepresentation, to leave it for a future generation to effect or perfect.

Matthew Parker having, it will be remembered, graduated in the year 1525, returned for a short time to his native place. He found a united family, Master Baker having proved himself a father equally affectionate to his wife's children and to his own. The difficulties, and even the dangers, of travel were at that time so many and so great, that visits, few and far between, were generally of long duration. Parker now remained at home for about two years; but he was not the man to pass his time in idleness. I have already traced his professional history to the 15th of June, 1527, when he was ordained priest.

His ordination did not include a licence to preach. Before the Reformation, as is still in churches under the Roman obedience, so many of the offices of religion are reduced to a kind of histrionic display, and the mind is so dissipated by a conglomeration of ceremonial details, that to a large portion of the clergy little time is left for the pursuits of learning; and, in the sixteenth century, literature was by no means so closely connected with the clerical profession as at the present time. Ordination was sought by a large body of men springing from the lower classes of society, and endowed with some slight intellectual power, as the means of obtaining a scanty subsistence more easily than by manual labour. The upper classes of the clergy were landed proprietors, possessing large estates in the character of glebes, or through the system of fines; and these persons were employed in high offices in Church and State, seldom residing on their benefices. Under them was the class of clergy just described, upon whom devolved the ordinary duties of the ministry, or who were employed, as we have before had occasion to remark, in promoting litigation instead of

CHAP.  
VII.

Matthew  
Parker.  
1559-75.

At Nor-  
wich.

Priests not  
necessarily  
preachers.

CHAP.  
VII.Matthew  
Parker.  
1559-75.

furthering the cause of peace in the lower ecclesiastical courts. These persons were not permitted to preach without a licence, first obtained from the bishop; for it would have been impossible to surmise beforehand the amount of nonsense to which they might have given utterance. As the business in the ecclesiastical courts diminished, and as many of the beneficed clergy were compelled to reside in their vicinity, proctors became discontented: if, as sometimes happened, they had the gift of eloquence, they became preachers of sedition; and many of them, taking part in the reform movement, were not so much the asserters of God's truth, as the maligners of their superiors.\*

Parker  
licensed to  
preach.  
1533.

The parties thus described could only be fairly met by preachers selected from the really learned members of the Universities, among whom Parker already ranked high. It is remarkable, however, that although Parker was ordained priest in 1527, he was not licensed to preach till 1533. This was the year in which Dr. Cranmer was consecrated Archbishop of Canterbury. To represent Cranmer, however, as at this time a Protestant, would be an anachronism, of which only the ignorance of ultra-Protestantism, or the malice of Romanism, could be guilty. Cranmer and Latimer would, at this time, have been among the first to commit Parker to the flames, had he propounded some of those opinions for which they themselves, at a later period, laid down their lives. Nevertheless, Parker's appointment was significant. It is remarkable in his history, that he never sought high office, although he did not shrink from discharging its duties when he was duly called. He was invited to be a preacher,

\* It was to meet the views of this unlearned class of the clergy, who, when the Bible was translated and put in their hands, had become really religious and devout, that the Homilies were provided. They were able to read, though not to write.



and a zealous preacher he became. He was selected because Cranmer, as at that time were Gardyner and Bonner, was, on the question of the divorce of Queen Katherine, on the side of the king against the pope. The pulpit was often employed, as is the public press in the present age, to create a public opinion, or to sustain it. Parker was a safe man in this respect. He was a young man of learning, siding with the king on the divorce question, and known to be on the side of progress. We may truly say that he was a reformer, even in 1533, if we bear in mind that the Reform party had not, up to this period, formed any definite opinions as a class. It was certainly not Protestant, and, as we have shown, it could not have been Calvinistic. It was accused of Germanizing; and, without being conscious of the fact, many members of the party may have coincided more or less in the opinions of Luther.

Matthew Parker noticed, as an important incident in his life, that he entered on the office of a preacher on the first Sunday of Advent, 1533. On that Sunday he preached at Grantchester; at Beach, or Landbeach, on the second Sunday in Advent; on the third Sunday at St. Bene't's church, Cambridge; at Madingley on the fourth; and on Christmas Day, which fell this year on a Sunday, at Barton. As these places were in the vicinity of Cambridge, many University men attended, and by them report was made of his eloquence, as well as of his learning. The Bishop of Ely appointed him to preach at his visitation, and again in 1534; and the Archbishop of Canterbury granted his licence to the young divine to preach throughout his province.

Parker was one of those men who, conscious of certain intellectual powers, are pleased when distinction is justly accorded to them; while, at the same time, they shrink

CHAP.  
VII.

Matthew  
Parker.

1559-75.



CHAP.  
VII.  
Matthew  
Parker.  
1559-75.

from the responsibility of office. Many such persons there are who would prefer to be second instead of first in command; to have the real power of office, while the semblance rests with another. If we do the work, and permit our superior in office to have the praise, there is scarcely anything that we cannot accomplish. Parker was now happily situated. A leading man in the University, he was consulted as an *amicus curiæ* by the chief people in the country. He knew himself to be useful as a preacher, when useful preachers were rare; and he stood aloof from that great world, which appeared to him like a volcano, fitted at any moment to be in eruption. To ascend its sides might lead to a more expansive view, and to an elevation in the sight of men; but, by the least false step, the unwary might be overwhelmed with the lava. He preferred to remain at the mountain's foot, and to point the way to those who desired to climb.

Chaplain  
to Queen  
Anne.  
1535.

Every one likes to be noticed by his superiors; but, at the same time, while he accepts the honour, a modest man may shrink from the responsible publicity of high office. We can understand, then, the feelings with which Parker, in March, 1535, received the following letter from Dr. Skyp, afterwards Bishop of Hereford, and at this time almoner to Queen Anne:—

“Mr. Parker, I commend me heartily unto you. Our friend Master Betts is departed out of this world. And the Queen's Grace commanded me to write unto you to the intent that ye should come up and speak with her with all the speed that ye can. I would ye might come before Easter; but if ye cannot, I pray you in any wise to be here in the week after, and then shall ye know further of her pleasure. Thus fare ye well.

“Your,

“JOHN SKIPPE.\*

“From Hampton Court,  
“The Tuesday after Palm Sunday.”

\* Corresp. p. 1.

In another letter, bearing the same date, Dr. Skyp says of Anne Boleyn, "I think her mind is to have you her chaplain. I pray you resist not your calling, but come in any wise, to know further of her pleasure. Bring with you a long gown, and that shall be enough until ye shall return to Cambridge." This summons Parker obeyed, and in due course became chaplain to the queen.

CHAP.  
VII.

Matthew  
Parker.  
1559 75.

Anne Boleyn has been the subject of undue vituperation on one side, and of eulogy, equally undeserved, on the other. This has been occasioned by the absurd mistake, already noticed, of those who draw a clear and distinct line between Roman Catholics and Protestants. Foxe, Burnet, and their followers call Anne Boleyn a Protestant queen; and the Protestants immediately have credited her with every grace that can adorn the female character. The Puritans forget the dissipations of her court,\* which were such as to induce Sir Thomas More to predict the shortness of her reign. But the question arises, What is meant by Protestantism? That she was decidedly anti-papal must be universally admitted. By the pope her marriage was declared to be invalid, and she was in constant alarm, lest Henry should be induced to reconcile himself to the Roman see; a proceeding not yet regarded, by either party, as an impossibility, especially if he could liberate himself from the fascinations of Queen Anne. To the anti-papal party, which at that time included such men as Gardiner and Bonner, as well as Cranmer, Ridley, and

Anne  
Boleyn.

\* Margaret Roper, when visiting her father, Sir Thomas More, in the Tower, was asked how Queen Anne was going on. "Faith, Father," she answered, "never better; there is nothing else in the court but dancing and sporting." "Alas! Meg," he replied, "these dances of hers will prove such dances, that she will spurn our heads off like footballs; but it will not be long before her own head will dance the same dance." Roper's Life of More. From the ~~privy~~ expenses of King Henry VIII., it appears that she was addicted to cards and dice.

CHAP.  
VII.

Matthew  
Parker.

1559-75.

Latimer, she gave her support. As indicating her attachment to the reformers, she availed herself of the royal permission to read the Bible, as it had lately been published, in the vulgar tongue ; but one step further than her husband she had no inclination to advance. The reformers found in him a supporter, when by them he was himself supported in the question of the divorce. He was with them when they preached against the unjust usurpations of the Bishop of Rome, and declared the king, under certain qualifications, to be the supreme head of the Church. He supported them when, by the suppression of the monasteries, they filled his exchequer, and weakened the popish power by turning the Regulars adrift. With similar feelings he supported them in exposing the nullity of miracles ascribed to popular saints, the lavish offerings at whose shrines found, in his estimation, a better place at the gambling tables of royalty. But if Queen Anne had expressed a doubt on transubstantiation, or purgatory, or the invocation of saints, or the celibacy of the clergy, or auricular confession, or the seven sacraments, the royal controversialist, proud of the "*Assertio septem sacramentorum adversus Martinum Lutherum*," would have translated her from the matrimonial couch to the scaffold. When we have accepted the seven sacraments, transubstantiation, purgatory, and the invocation of saints, the Protestant residuum, according to modern notions, will be small indeed. Neither Parker nor the queen were at this time Protestants in the modern sense of the word, although she may have been willing to hear from her chaplain that, in ecclesiastical affairs, amendments were required greater than had hitherto been accomplished.

Having mentioned the faults in Queen Anne's character, we must not leave unnoticed her generosity, her extreme readiness to do kind actions, when, in behalf of suffering

CHAP.  
VII.Matthew  
Parker.

1559-75.

humanity, an appeal was made to her charity. If the religious principle was not sufficiently strong to prevent her from doing evil, yet she encouraged those religious feelings which take pleasure in acts of devotion. It was this part of Queen Anne's character—her zeal against the pope and the ardour of her devotion—which attached to her the ecclesiastics who held office in her court, but were not likely to mingle in those dissipations in which their presence would be acceptable to no one, and least of all to her. Acting under the advice of Cheke and Parker, she supported several poor students at the university; and having a command of money, she devoted large sums to charitable objects.

As was the case with all who approached her, Parker was evidently attracted by her charms. He only saw the best parts of her character. His visits to court were few and far between, and the period of his chaplaincy did not extend much beyond a year. He referred to her in after life with kindly feelings, and in several letters he alludes to a conversation he had with her within six days of her fall, in which it would seem that, anticipating the possibility of such an event, she entreated him to watch as a paternal friend over her daughter, afterwards Queen Elizabeth.

Parker, at the same time, commended himself to the judgment of Henry VIII., for, having been appointed chaplain to the queen, he was in 1537 summoned to the court of the king, and made his chaplain. In the king's regard for Parker, the disgrace of Queen Anne made no alteration. Henry VIII. was quite capable of appreciating the faithfulness of Parker to the queen, if Parker were the author of that affecting letter which, in her last moments, Anne Boleyn is said to have transmitted to her husband. It appears from Parker's correspondence,\* that he had seen

Chaplain  
to the  
king.  
1537.

\* Corresp. p. 59.



CHAP.  
VII.Matthew  
Parker.

1559-75.

her not long before ; but Kingston, in one of his letters to Crumwell, relating to the queen, speaks of her almoner as having been with her at the last, and to him, probably, the document, if authentic, should be attributed ; for Parker, alluding on several occasions to his interviews with Anne Boleyn, does not mention this letter, which he would hardly have failed to notice, if he had been in any way concerned in it. We have had occasion before to remark on the destruction of all the documents relating to the public trials of this reign. That some dreadful revelation was made to Cranmer, who had come up to London with the intention of defending her cause, in his last interview with Anne Boleyn, is almost certain ; but it is equally certain that Parker regarded her as innocent, or thought her repentance sincere, from an expression parenthetically made in one of his letters, in which, speaking of Queen Anne, he says, " whose soul, I doubt not, is in blessed felicity with God." I may mention here what I have not seen noticed by other historians, that, when Parker was archbishop, he informed Burghley, when writing to him in 1572, confidentially, that at one time her majesty the queen had told him secretly of a pope's bull, wherein King Henry's marriage with Queen Anne was confirmed. " She willed me," wrote the archbishop, " to seek it out. I did so among mine old registers, and others which I thought might have it. I did it as secretly and prudently as I could, and to mine own self ; but I could not hear of it."\*

Officials were at this time seldom, if ever, paid by salaries. The notion of treating the clergy like tradesmen, paying them so much money for so much work done, had not entered into the minds of men. Certain

\* Lansdowne MSS. xv. Art. 50. It is possible that it was the queen's intention simply to mystify the archbishop.



landed estates were held by persons in holy orders, to which was assigned the performance of certain duties by the beneficiary himself, or his deputy.\*

CHAP.  
VII.

Matthew  
Parker.

1559-75.

The deanery of Stoke by Clare was attached by custom to the office of queen's chaplain. The deanery had been held by "Master Betts," and by his predecessor, the chaplain of Queen Katharine. When Catherine Parr shared the throne of Henry VIII., she evidently thought that her connection with the college was so close, that in its concerns she had a right to interfere. On one occasion we find her recommending a bailiff, and on another she interfered to obtain the beneficial lease of a manor for one of her friends. The requests are gracefully preferred; but coming from the queen of Henry VIII., they were regarded, of course, in the light of commands.†

Stoke by Clare, or Stoke next Clare, was originally an alien priory—in fact, a cell of the celebrated abbey of Bec. Its founder was Richard of Tonbridge, or of Clare, Earl of Hertford. In the year 1124, he translated the Benedictine monks of Bec, whom his father had placed in his castle of Clare, first into the parish church of St. Augustine, and afterwards to this priory, which he endowed with the manor of Stoke Hoe. It was released in 1395 by Richard II. from its subjection to the foreign abbey of Bec, and it became *indigena* on the payment of 1,000 marks, which were appropriated in aid of the new works at St. Peter's, Westminster.‡ In 1415, Edmund

Dean of  
Stoke.  
1535.

\* Within the memory of the writer of these pages, the royal chaplains had a table provided for them in the king's palace, and this honour was their sole remuneration. They now receive a fixed salary, and their table is discontinued. The professional man receives an honorarium; the tradesman demands pay.

† The letters are preserved among the MSS. of Corpus Christi College, Cambridge.

‡ Monast. Anglic., and Richard Taylor's Index Monasticus.

CHAP.  
VII.

Matthew  
Parker.

1559-75.

Mortimer, Earl of March, its patron, obtained the royal permission to change this into a college of secular priests. The constitutions were drawn up in 1422 by Thomas Barneslay, at that time dean. The college consisted of a dean, from six to ten prebendaries, eight vicars, four clerks, six choristers. It was pleasantly situated in a close, surrounded by six acres of land and an orchard. It was richly endowed with lands, rents, tithes, portions, and pensions in fifty-six parishes. Among the endowments was the payment of 8,000 eels annually from Fordiam and Lackenheath.

For the next twelve or thirteen years Stoke by Clare was the happy home of Matthew Parker. Here he delighted to gather his friends around him ; and by one of them, Walter Haddon, his residence at Stoke was called "Parker's Tusculanum ;" a place which seemed, as it were, created for scholars, both to receive and impart instruction—a *locus ad delectationes honestas et ingenuas aptissimus*. An occasional supply of venison from the royal forests enabled Parker to entertain his neighbours. Among his papers we find a mandate of Henry VIII. to "Master Forester, of our forest of Weybridge, desiring him to deliver, or cause to be delivered, unto our trusty and well-beloved Matthew Parker, chaplain to our dearest wife the queen, one doe of season."

When Parker became archbishop he had a right to claim a certain number of bucks from the different royal parks ; and, on one occasion, he received "a great and a fat stag," killed by the fair hand of Queen Elizabeth herself, and forwarded, by her express command, through Lord Robert Dudley.\* While he was at Stoke, his larder was frequently supplied by the kind consideration of the queen consort, and, with a command of eels at all times,

\* Corresp. p. 190.

he found no difficulty in keeping up that hospitality, which implied the providing board at a common table to all who lodged within the precincts of the college. Into his garden he introduced the tuberose and the pink, and regaled his friends occasionally upon apricots, which had been lately introduced from Epirus.

When the report prevailed that monasteries and religious houses were in danger, the hypocrisy of the monks being more offensive to the people than the profligacy of the courtiers who sought to supersede them, Parker felt that the only chance of securing the permanency of establishments such as that over which he was presiding, was to adapt them to the requirements of the age. His first attempt as a reformer was now made. He established a grammar school, in which the children of the neighbourhood were to be brought up in all the studies of humanity. He provided a yearly stipend for the master, and procured for him learned assistance. According to the custom of the age, the wealthy were required to pay in money. Poorer persons, desiring a learned education, offered their services for the discharge of the menial offices. It was counted no shame in that age for persons who had not money, to act as servitors; and the opulent, upon whom they waited, readily received them on equal terms to the same classes as themselves. Parker's school, under his superintendence, soon became popular. He required the prebendaries, all of them, to be preachers, and sent them, from time to time, to preach the gospel in parishes in which the college had estates. The boys in the school were taught to sing and to play upon the organs. The statutes were considered to be models of what such statutes ought to be, and were translated by Sir John Cheke, who, on the dissolution of the college, became one of the grantees.

CHAP.  
VII.

Matthew  
Parker.

1559-75.

CHAP.  
VII.Matthew  
Parker.

1559-75.

Creed and  
Pater-  
noster in  
the vulgar  
tongue.  
1536.

A.D. 1537.

A.D. 1538.

A.D. 1543.

Parker, who never hurried anything, readily adopted all the improvements of the age, as they were forced upon Henry VIII. ; and progress, during this reign, was, in point of fact, greater than is generally supposed. In 1536, he readily obeyed the royal injunction ; and having obtained copies of the translations lately made of the Creed, the Decalogue, and the Paternoster; caused them to be read in the vulgar tongue, in all the churches in which he had influence, or over which he had control. In 1537 he took a deep interest in one of the most important publications of the period, "The Godly and Pious Institution of a Christian Man," commonly called the Bishops' Book. In all the parishes within the peculiar jurisdiction of the Dean of Stoke, he adopted the parish registers in accordance with the instructions issued by Crumwell in 1538. He accepted with pleasure, and acted upon it, the royal mandate which, in 1543, directed the Litany to be said in English. However much disappointed he may have been in the reactionary spirit manifested in the King's Book, he received compensation when, in 1545, the Primer made its appearance, containing a form of prayer for morning and evening, in the English tongue.

A deep mortification awaited Parker on the enactment of the Statute of Six Articles. Mixing, at that time, in general society, he had won the affections of one who was a lady by birth and education, and the only impediment to their marriage was offered by this statute. We have had occasion before to remark, that Parker was thought of as likely to be a bishop when, in 1541, the sees of Peterborough, Oxford, and Gloucester were established, the bishoprics of Bristol and Chester being constituted in the following year. From his determination to enter into the holy estate of matrimony, we can account for his refusal.



Although he was much too cautious to marry in defiance of the law, it was the general opinion, that the Statute of Six Articles was only a temporary and minatory measure; and he entertained little doubt that, ere long, the government would see the wisdom of conniving, to say the least of it, at the marriage of the clergy. Although among thinking men the demoralization of the clergy was attributed in part to their constrained celibacy, yet it is astonishing to observe how long a prejudice against clerical marriages existed. The marriage of a bishop would have created a disturbance in the public mind. Even to a very late period such marriages have been rare. Determined, therefore, to marry, Parker thought it expedient to decline a bishopric. Looking forward to the establishment of a family, he preferred making provision for it by an accumulation of several smaller preferments to the acquisition of one calculated to excite the envious passions of his contemporaries. The prejudice against pluralities did not at that time exist. So long as a good man was provided to discharge parochial duties, the parishioners made no inquiry as to the terms upon which he entered on an engagement with his principal. It was not till the clergy were surrounded with large families that such a question arose. Before that time, a man engaged in the public service, either in Church or State, was put to expenses which he met by an accumulation of small benefices. The unambitious man, preferring private life, and having no family claims upon him, was content when food and raiment were provided for him. Parker therefore, without any compunctious visitings of conscience, records that, in 1542, he was presented to the living of Ashen in Essex. About the same time, when the king was establishing secular priests in the cathedral of Ely, he caused Parker to be installed in the second prebend esta-

CHAP.  
VII.Matthew  
Parker.

1559-75.

Rector of  
Ashen.  
1542.Pre-  
bendary  
of Ely.  
1542.



CHAP.  
VII.Matthew  
Parker.

1559-75.

Rector of  
Burling-  
ham.

1544.

Rector of  
Land-  
beach.  
1545.

blished in that church. In 1544 Parker resigned Ashen, and was presented, probably in exchange, to the rectory of Burlingham, in his native county of Norfolk. In 1545 he obtained the living of Landbeach from Corpus Christi College, of which he had become master in 1544. Although Parker, until the year 1547, divided his time chiefly between Stoke and Cambridge, he felt it his duty to visit occasionally his other benefices; and he desired, therefore, to concentrate his preferments either in the vicinity of Cambridge, or near his home in Norfolk.

At this time he was indefatigable as a preacher, and as preachers were few, and the prevalent ignorance was great, he was rejoicing in the thought of his having become an instrument in the Divine hand for promoting God's glory, the good of his Church, and the benefit of his fellow-creatures. But wherever the servants of God are active, the author of evil, the accuser of the brethren, is diligent, by himself or through his agents, to frustrate their labours, and to raise against them a persecution. Some of the inhabitants of Clare, under the leadership of one George Colt, accused Dr. Parker of heresy before the Lord Chancellor Audley. Having pointed out that the splendid ceremonials of Easter Day were a vain pageant, unless they were an indication that they who took part in them were dead to sin, and determined to walk in newness of life, Dr. Parker was accused of turning into ridicule the ceremonies of that blessed festival. Having preached that, for those who had no regard for the mystery of the Cross, it was mere superstition to worship the wood of the Cross, he was accused of denying the atonement. At the time of the Pilgrimages of Grace, and of the rising in Lincolnshire under the Prior of Barlings, Parker exhorted the people to contribute with cheerfulness towards the expenses of war, since, without incurring such expenses, the

Accused  
of heresy.  
1539.

king could not maintain the peace of the realm. He was now accused of asserting that, by the money levied from the commons, the king purchased a dishonourable peace.

Not only were these charges pronounced to be frivolous and vexatious, but a kind message was sent to Parker by the Lord High Chancellor, "to go on, and not to fear such enemies."\* Very different was the treatment which Parker received from his diocesan, Dr. Nykke.† There was a party in Clare who regarded with alarm the reforming principles of the Dean of Stoke, and whose desire it was to counteract his influence. With this object in view, they obtained from the bishop a licence to preach for Dr. Stokes, who was a man of mark, being a D.D. of Cambridge and prior of the Austin Friars at Norwich.‡ Upon the arrival of Dr. Stokes at Clare, Parker addressed to him a letter, in which he stated, "that if he came to decry the truth which Parker had preached, or to make invectives to the decay of the king's authority and lawful ordinances, or to sow schism and confusion among the people," he, Parker, "must and would, according to his duty, give information against him; but that if it were his intention to declare the truth and edify the king's

CHAP.  
VII.

Matthew  
Parker.  
1559-75.

Dr. Stokes.

\* See a note in Parker's own hand, on his letter to Dr. Stokes, preserved in the library of Corpus Christi College, Cambridge.

† Richard Nykke was consecrated to the see of Norwich in 1501, and died on the 14th of January, 1536. He was succeeded by Dr. Rugg or Reps. Strype must therefore be in error, when he represents Dr. Stokes as sent to preach against Parker in 1537 by Bishop Nix, as he calls him. Rugg was a mere timeserver, and it is difficult to conjecture why he should take part against Parker after Lord Audley's judgment. The measures were probably taken by Bishop Nykke, whose successor let things take their course.

‡ Parker MSS., Corpus Christi College, Cambridge, cviii. Art. 38. Draft of answer. The date is not given; but, as Audley was made Chancellor on the 29th of November, 1538, we may probably date the letter in 1539.

CHAP.  
VII.Matthew  
Parker.  
1559-75.

subjects, he would promise to join hands with him and live on friendly terms." \* The letter is too long for transcription; but, for style and temper, it does much credit to the writer; the more so, since, in the life of Cardinal Pole, we have had instances of the extreme violence of language in which controversialists in the sixteenth century indulged. This advice, Dr. Stokes was not wise enough to follow. He rendered himself obnoxious to the king's government, and was for a short time imprisoned. He was not a straightforward man, for when, among other things, allusion was made to his exciting an unnecessary controversy against Parker, Dr. Stokes, in writing to the Lord Privy Seal, denied that he had done so, although it was known that he was sent to Clare for the very purpose of counteracting the effects of Parker's preaching.

Parker's favour with the government was manifested when he received a summons from the Lord Privy Seal to preach at Paul's Cross. The appointment was a gratifying one, as the Lord Privy Seal expressly stated, that it was made "out of respect to the honest report of Parker's learning in holy letters, and incorrupt judgment in the same."

Dissolution  
of Stoke  
threatened.  
1545.

In 1545, Parker heard, with astonishment and alarm, that the possessions of colleges, of hospitals, and of all institutions that could be brought under the denomination of a religious house, were to form part of that confiscation of ecclesiastical property, by which the royal coffers might be filled. It was at the option of the king to seize the property of any religious house, except a cathedral, or for a consideration to spare it. Parker read in this iniquitous act of Parliament the doom of Stoke next Clare, unless he exerted himself for its preservation, and in his exertions he was successful.

\* E. Bibliothec. Corpus Christi College, Cambridge. Miscellan. O.

CHAP.  
VII.Matthew  
Parker.

1559-75.

Parker was aware that, if he were ejected from this deanery, he would receive compensation by the offer of higher preferment; but his attachment to his native county prevented him from listening to the most favourable terms. Nothing, indeed, could compensate him for the loss of a home, rendered "the more homely" by his good taste, and surrounded by orchards and gardens where the scholar had composed those discourses by which his name had already become famous, and through which many had been led to seek the one thing needful. That home he had been preparing for a wife; for Margaret Harleston and Matthew Parker had long been attached to one another, and were patiently "biding their time," until the king's changeful mind and the persuasions of Cranmer had again rendered the marriage of the clergy legal.

The person who, next to the dean, was interested in the preservation of Stoke College, was the queen consort. The college, as we have before remarked, was under her patronage; and, if it were dissolved, together with other establishments of the same kind, her chaplain would in future have to be paid out of the privy purse, or, as was already the case with the king's chaplains, the remuneration would consist solely in the honour conferred. Parker succeeded in interesting Henry's sixth wife, Catherine Parr, in the fate of his college. It was easy to justify her interference. Stoke College was situated in the midst of the queen's tenants, and, on this account, the patronage had been conceded to her. In the hospitality of the college, and the civilizing society of its inmates, the wealthier tenants found edification and amusement, at a time when the metropolis was seldom visited, and these institutions might be regarded as civilized colonies in different parts of the world. The labourers on the estate, in the mean time, were accustomed to apply to the college



CHAP.  
VII.

Matthew  
Parker.

1559-75.

in all their difficulties and distresses, and, by the charity there liberally displayed, the queen's exchequer was spared expenses, from which it would have otherwise been unable to escape. All received instruction, and that at a time when, in the excitement of the age, good instruction was specially needed. In addressing the queen, and soliciting her interposition, Parker referred with satisfaction to the exertions of the dean and his prebendaries. High and low, her tenants were gratuitously instructed in the new learning; and such had been their hospitality, that persons coming from a distance, on the queen's business, would remain at Stoke with their suites for seven or eight days, making the college their home. These facts were laid before the queen, and in pleading the cause of her college she was successful with Henry VIII. What was practicable under Henry VIII. became impossible when the queen consort had become the queen dowager, and a new kennel of courtiers were let loose upon the Church to devour it. The property, which had hitherto supported many, and in the enjoyment of which the poorest man on the estate might hope to see his son have a share, was now transferred to another class of society, and the poor, unconsciously wronged, were taught to approve of a system which only tended to further the selfishness of the wealthy few.

Ousted  
from  
Stoke.  
1547.

The confiscation took place; but, except for the extreme inconvenience of being turned out of his home, Parker had few grounds of complaint personally. The confiscated estate was purchased by a college friend, Sir John Cheke; and the pension of forty pounds a year, with which it was saddled, was paid regularly to the ousted dean. He had to quit his home in obedience, as he expresses it, to an act of Parliament, on the 1st of April, 1547. In the way of compensation he was, in 1552, appointed to

Dean of  
Lincoln.  
1552.

the deanery of Lincoln. He retained the mastership of Corpus Christi College, to which, it will be recollected, he was appointed in 1544.

CHAP.  
VII.

Matthew  
Parker.

1559-75.

Parker immediately started for his new deanery, and was installed in person. After this he divided his time between Lincoln and Cambridge, making occasional visits to his friends in Norwich.

Although the new reign, and the avarice of Edward VI.'s counsellors, drove Parker from the home he loved, he was, nevertheless, able to console himself by a marriage with the lady to whom he had been engaged for seven years. The act, indeed, authorizing the marriage of the clergy, was not obtained until the year 1549; but Parker felt so sure that the privilege could not be withheld, that, on the 24th of June, 1547, he became the happy husband of Margaret Harleston. The law, as it then stood, regarded clerical marriages as voidable, but not void; and when Parker heard that the Archbishop of Canterbury was awaiting at Dover the arrival of Mrs. Cranmer from the Continent, he felt sure that the penalties to which a married clerk was still liable would not be enforced. He was in his forty-third year when he led to the altar Mistress Margaret, the daughter of Robert Harleston, esquire, in the county of Norfolk. She was twenty-eight years of age. Never was man more fortunate in his marriage. A lady by birth and manners, Mrs. Parker, according to the custom of the age, had received an education which enabled her to sympathize with her husband in his studies and ecclesiastical pursuits; at the same time she was endowed with such sound common sense, that she so managed his household affairs as to enable him to keep hospitality, and maintain his dignity as a lord spiritual, without being involved in debt. When, during the reign of Queen Mary, Parker was reduced in circum-

Married.  
1547.

CHAP.  
VII.Matthew  
Parker.

1559-75.

stances, and with an increasing family found it difficult to make both ends meet, she contrived to render the home of her husband comfortable, and, with a decreasing income, still to maintain the respectability of the family. The kindness with which, in Edward VI.'s time, she entertained her husband's guests in his college at Cambridge, is incidentally and gratefully mentioned by some of his correspondents.

The master's lodge at Corpus Christi College was the first place to which men of learning and piety repaired, when circumstances brought them to Cambridge. It was to his friend Dr. Parker's house that Martin Bucer repaired, when he happened to be in want of a dinner; and, when he was in need of money to pay his bills, it was to Dr. Parker's purse that he had recourse. To the entertainment of her husband's guests, Mrs. Parker contributed by her ready wit, her genial courtesy, and a conversation replete with common sense. Even grave divines like Bishop Ridley condescended to pay compliments to Mrs. Parker; and much is implied in the appellation, when that great prelate would speak jocosely of "Parker's lady abbess." When, in after times, and in the reign of Elizabeth, Mrs. Parker was called upon to preside over the household of the first peer of the realm, royalty only excepted, we are told that, in Parker's palace, everything was done nobly and splendidly. To her management the archbishop left everything; and, while she was economical in her arrangements, she knew that her husband's was a generous spirit, and in his generosity she cordially sympathized.

The quiet manner in which such men as Cranmer and Parker consented, for a time, to separate from their wives, or to defer their marriage, confirms what has been stated in the life of Cranmer, that, by those who were at the

head of affairs, the Statute of Six Articles was regarded as only a temporary measure, necessary to meet the violent aggressions of the Anabaptists, but sure to be repealed when its purpose had been answered. It was like a suspension of the Habeas Corpus Act in modern times. We may feel assured of this, that if measures of reform had not been privately, and by the king's connivance, prepared in the reign of Henry VIII., it would have been impossible to have effected those reforms, which were almost instantaneously enacted, when, on the 28th of January, 1547, Edward VI. ascended the throne. The Statute of Six Articles was immediately repealed. The first book of Homilies, already composed, was now published, and through these Homilies some of the chief doctrines of the Reformation were promulgated. The sacrament of the altar was, according to primitive usage, administered in both kinds. Proclamations were soon after issued against superstitious observances, most obnoxious to the reformers, such as carrying candles on Candlemass Day, and ashes on Ash Wednesday; and orders were given for the removal of images, wherever they had been treated with superstitious respect. In 1548 a commission was issued to certain of the bishops, with whom were associated other divines, whose business it was to subject to a careful examination, the Breviary, the Missal, the Manual, and other office books of the Church, with a view to their translation into the vulgar tongue, and the cutting off of all false doctrine.\*

So well prepared were these divines, by previous study and consultation, for the great work, to execute which

CHAP.  
VII.

Matthew  
Parker.  
1559-75.

Reforms of  
1547.

Reforms of  
1549.

\* The Breviary contained the daily services, including the lessons. The Missal contained the service for the Holy Communion, including the Epistle and Gospel. The Manual contained the Offices of Baptism, Visitation of the Sick, and other rites and ceremonies.



CHAP.  
VII.

Matthew  
Parker.

1559-75.

First  
Prayer-  
Book.  
1549.

they were commissioned, that, in about seven months' time, that is to say, at the end of November, 1548, Dr. Parker received at Cambridge a copy of the book of Common Prayer, commonly described as the First Book of Edward VI. Everything was done in that orderly manner which was always satisfactory to the mind of Parker. By the commissioners it had been submitted to Convocation; by Convocation it was sent to the king in council; by the Privy Council it was laid before the great council of the nation assembled in Parliament; by Parliament it was incorporated into an act—the first Act of Uniformity. This act, embodying the Prayer Book exactly as it was sent up by Convocation, was passed at the end of January, 1549; and, on the following Whit-Sunday, it was taken into general use. Thus were superseded those various Uses which had hitherto prevailed in our Church, and one form of worship was adopted throughout the land. To divines like Parker, whose minds had been uncontaminated by foreign controversies, or by contact with what Parker calls “Germanical natures,” this book was entirely satisfactory; the ancient religious formularies were blended into one, unscriptural superstitions were tacitly abolished, medieval observances were superseded by primitive practice, and all was translated into a language “understood of the people.” It seemed that a work of wonder had been accomplished, and that all that was required was to reform the other offices of the Church in deference to the primitive and scriptural principles hitherto observed. Consequently, in the same year, a commission was issued to six prelates and six divines, for the reformation, revision, and translation of the Ordinal, in which it was proclaimed, that to all men diligently reading the Holy Scripture and ancient authors, it was evident that, from the Apostles' time, there had

been these orders of ministers in Christ's Church—bishops, priests, and deacons : bishops, with the power of handing on the apostolical succession; priests, with the power of consecrating the eucharist; deacons, with the honourable office of assisting the other two orders; so careful were our early reformers to carry on the apostolical succession, or, in other words, to show that their object was, not to establish a new sect, but to reform their ancient Church.

CHAP.  
VII.

Matthew  
Parker.  
1559-75.

Unfortunately for the Church and the realm, "Germanical principles," together with Zwinglianism, were found to be more prevalent in England among the learned few, than was expected or desired. Men at the head of affairs, like Somerset and Cranmer, had formed no definite principles of their own, and were easily moved by every wind of strange doctrine. Not content with the verdict of learned Englishmen, they invited to England foreign teachers, who, although they did not agree among themselves, were accustomed to find fault with everything, and they too soon taught our people to join them in assailing the Book of Common Prayer.\* It was contrary to the policy of some of the leading statesmen to permit the reformation to be conducted quietly and peaceably. It was by the quarrels of churchmen that they hoped to obtain possession of the property of the Church, and, in a desire to have a scramble, the lower orders united with them. Hence, in 1552, the Prayer Book was revised, and a new Act of Uniformity was passed.

Revision  
of the  
Prayer  
Book.  
1552.

A rapid sketch has thus been given of the reforms which took place during the short reign of Edward VI., because in all of them Parker acquiesced; and though he preferred the first Prayer Book to the second, with the second, with some slight alterations, he was quite ready

\* See Vol. VII. p. 25.

CHAP.  
VII.Matthew  
Parker.

1559-75.

Parker's  
inactivity.

to concur. We cannot advert to the fact without expressing our surprise, that, in these stirring times, Parker took no part in the conduct of public affairs. Although taking an active part in what related to his college and university, and although he was consulted very frequently by his superiors, he lived in comparative retirement. It was not from want of solicitation on the part of those engaged in state affairs, who were aware of his sagacity, learning, and discretion. Within a short time after the king's accession, Parker was summoned by the Council to preach at Paul's Cross. He evidently did this willingly; but when the archbishop sounded him, to know whether, if invited to preach before the king, he would be willing to attend, to the primate's letter he returned no answer. He thought that it was only a compliment, and that he might treat it as such; and it was not till a command from the king himself, through the Bishop of Westminster, Dr. Thirlby, was addressed to him, that he preached at court; the result of which was, as he expected and feared, that he was made one of the royal chaplains. By Bishop Ridley he was earnestly entreated to preach at Paul's Cross. The bishop informed him of the difficulty he experienced in finding suitable preachers. "I may have," he said, "if I would call without any choice [preachers] enow; but in some, alas! I desire more learning, in some a better judgement, in some more virtue and godly conversation, in some more soberness and discretion. And he in whom all these do concur shall not do well to refuse (in my judgement) to serve God in that place." He would not bring the Council to command the service, but he would rather proffer a request.\* Notwithstanding this appeal, Parker shrank from the duty, and earnestly desired to be excused. It was part of his nature in all

\* Corresp. p. 45.



things to do his best, and, without vanity, he might fairly suppose that, if he did his best, he would be again employed, and brought into that public life which he desired to avoid. However strong was his desire for retirement, his merits were so well known, that, on the 13th of December, he received a document, signed by the leading members of the Privy Council, in which it is stated: "Whereas the king's majesty hath willed us to send for you, to confer with you and take your opinion in certain things touching his highness' service: these are to pray you, upon the sight hereof, to put yourself in a readiness to make your repair hither unto us as soon as ye conveniently may for the purpose aforesaid."\*

CHAP.  
VII.  
Matthew  
Parker.  
1559-75.

For what purpose the Council desired Dr. Parker's opinion is not apparent; but there is another letter extant, written by Bishop Latimer, in which he remonstrates with Dr. Parker for refusing to take an active part in things pertaining to Church and State. What were Parker's real reasons, if any, beyond the apparent ones, existing in his mind, it is useless to conjecture. He was unmoved by these flattering solicitations, and remained at Cambridge, paying visits occasionally to Lincoln and to Norwich. He did not shrink from controversy when it was forced upon him, though he never sought it.

When Bishop Ridley and others came to Cambridge, and held a discussion on the subject of transubstantiation, Parker felt it his duty, as a leading member of the university, to take part in the discussion. The fact is, that although he was a reformer, he was not by any means an enthusiastic Protestant; and, though he was not opposed to the government of Edward, he was by no means inclined to support a ministry which had robbed him of his pro-

\* Corresp. p. 46.



CHAP.  
VII.

Matthew  
Parker.

1559-75.

perty. For this surmise we have some authority, for Parker wrote and published a powerful tract, which is to be found in Strype's Collectanea, and is described by him as "a learned discourse of Dr. Parker against the alienation of the revenues of the Church." He mentions that, to the avarice of the great nobles, Martin Bucer was accustomed to trace the calamities to which Germany was at this time exposed, and by which that country, guilty of what he called the *sacrilegium et diminutionem patrimonii crucifixi*, had called down the divine wrath. One thing is certain, that among the insurgents in Norfolk under Kett, Parker was at first decidedly popular.

It is further to be remarked, that through his preaching, and the preaching of his associates of Stoke College, this was the only place in which the Reformation was received by the common people without opposition, and, we may even say, with some measure of favour. The arbitrary acts of the government, which, under the pretext of reformation, set law and the rights of property at defiance, brought the Reformation itself into peril so early as the year 1549, and thus unintentionally prepared the way for the terrible reaction of the following reign. The opposition to the Reformation was, at first, nearly confined to the Regulars, who had been turned out of church and home; but when the Seculars became alarmed, under the notion that what was done with respect to the monasteries was only paving the way to an attack upon all ecclesiastical property, the zeal began to slumber, which, alarmed under Mary, was only kindled into enthusiasm in the reign of Elizabeth. But, admitting this, there were other circumstances over which the government could exercise no control, but which caused a strong feeling of discontent.

Feudal  
system.

Superficial readers and writers are so accustomed to dwell upon the faults of the feudal system, and the

miseries which attended its decadence, that they forget that no system whatever could for a long time prevail, unless it possessed some counterbalancing advantages. There was, under the feudal system, a reciprocity of benefits: service rendered was repaid by protection; rights were claimed and admitted on both sides, and an appeal was made, not merely to what was sordid and base in human nature, but also to the affections on either side. Self-love, if not selfishness, conduced to this, when the power of the landed proprietor depended mainly on the forces he could bring into the field in time of war; when the nobleman was applauded by the sovereign for the gallant appearance of his well-appointed retainers; when the sons of the labourers, if really little better than serfs of the soil, were well fed and well cared for; when, in time of peace, old and young felt that they possessed certain rights in the soil, for which they were ready to fight; when, in the field sports, master and man met together on an equality; when, on festive occasions, the inhabitants of the cottages felt that they had a position in the lordly castle, even when visited by royalty; goodwill was found generally to prevail; and the landed proprietor, who disregarded the welfare of the people, was accounted as a man not only hard of heart, but neglectful of his own interest. Fully admitting that as the system was dying out, the abuses became more oppressive and apparent, it cannot be denied that, under such a system, much of physical happiness prevailed. Admitting, also, that the system by which it has been superseded, is more conducive to the national welfare, by rendering each man more independent, we cannot shut our eyes to the fact that, in the transition from one system to another, there could not fail to be grounds of discontent. These grounds of discontent were, in some measure, substantial; but the

CHAP.  
VII.  
Matthew  
Parker.  
1559-75.

CHAP.  
VII.

Matthew  
Parker.

1559-75.

discontent became more alarming, when the appeal was made also to the imagination, and the demagogue could suggest that an attempt was made to rob the poor of their rights.

A great middle class had risen in the country; that middle class which is the strength and pride of England, which has limited the power of the crown, and controlled the pretensions of the aristocracy, into which all classes can obtain admission. It was a revolution, silent and progressive, as revolutions in England have generally been, but not free from that attendant suffering from which no revolution can be entirely exempt. The first step was taken when land was brought into the market. The moneyed men in the cities became large purchasers. The landed aristocracy has always in England taken precedence of the commercial aristocracy; and the merchant princes desire the estates of the ancient nobility, without, in the first instance, recognizing the responsibility of property, in the recognition of which the safety of England at this time mainly depends. The nobleman, when he had squandered the price of his land in the dissipations of the court and the metropolis, viewed with no friendly feeling the stranger revelling in those ancestral halls, from which, through his vices, he had become self-expatriated. Throughout the disturbances of this period, complaint was frequently made by the government, that, from the ranks of the aristocracy, insurgents were sure to find leaders, whom, from old associations, they delighted to follow and to serve. The commons themselves felt bitterly the change of masters. In place of the old hereditary chief, they found a landlord in their parish, who, instead of identifying his interests with those of his tenants and neighbours, thought only of obtaining the maximum of work for the minimum of pay. They purchased the



land as an investment of their money, and, having made a bargain, they felt it due to themselves to make the best of it. The new proprietors were distinguished from the old barons by the title of gentlemen, and "Down with the gentlemen!" was the cry from one end of England to the other. Many of them became purchasers of the abbey lands and of church property, and let them at rack rents. Hundreds of farmers with their families were driven from holdings, the tenure of which their ancestors, though paying a rent, had regarded as indisputably secure. Many held estates by easy leases, in the shape of fines, to be paid to the church or monasteries, perfectly certain that, when times were hard, there would be a mitigation in their payment. The families of franklins had most of them certain rights in the monasteries themselves. Here, if their children were ambitious to become ministers of state or learned divines, they could claim, on the ground of some half-forgotten benefaction, a gratuitous education. Here, for the aged and infirm, corrodies might be demanded or easily procured from the charity of the lords, who, in founding a monastery, had reserved therein certain rights for their family and their tenants. Here the sick would find the best advice, and a labourer might live to see a son of his house riding before him in prelatie pomp. The reformers could tell how these advantages, for such at one time they were, had been perverted and abused; they could dwell on the iniquities permitted to exist unrebuked in some monasteries; they could point out how funds, provided for the studious and ascetic, had tendered to the fostering of luxury, carnality, and pride; but still, in all cases except the very worst, the people could look back with pleasure to what had been, and demand with indignation, What have you given us in return? Of the farmer and the poor there was now no

CHAP.  
VII.

Matthew  
Parker.

1559-75.

Disturb-  
ances of  
1549.



CHAP.  
VII.Matthew  
Parker.

1559-75.

thought. The gentlemen who had bought the land found it profitable to become graziers, whose interest it was to diminish the number of able-bodied men on their several estates. Those wide-spread commons, which, from the earliest English times, long before the Conquest, had been regarded as the poor man's estate, were now inclosed; and, by that inclosure, the poor man regarded himself as robbed of his rights. A robbery and a wrong it was, more infamous than that of the monasteries. But it was a mere question of might against right, without an attempt to show that the lower orders were more depraved than the sybarites of the court, who, in becoming courtiers, had ceased to be princes of the land. They became minions of the prince, instead of fathers of the people; and who shall blame an oppressed people, when they took up arms to assert their rights, we might almost say, to defend their lives?

To the discontented agriculturists the ousted monks were soon found to attach themselves. Thousands of these there were, who, at one time enjoying a competence, if not living in luxury, were now reduced to penury and want, complaining loudly that the pensions promised to them were irregularly paid, even if paid at all. To these were added the usual number of vagabonds who, having nothing to lose, are always ready for a scramble. The Anabaptists, the successors of the Lollards, were still propagating what we should now call Socialistic principles; and these, together with discharged soldiers, who claimed as a debt due to them the wages which the government was unable, if not unwilling, to pay, were always ready to swell a mob. All these classes were indignant, and, in their indignation, the mass of the people sympathized, when they found that Somerset had engaged foreign troops against the subjects of the King of England.

Yorkshire was again prepared for a rising; Northamptonshire and the midland counties were in a state of insubordination. But the government was most alarmed at the state of affairs in Cornwall and Devonshire: there, 20,000 strong, the insurgents for a long time held out against the most experienced generals of the royal army.

The failure of the insurrection is to be attributed, as is so frequently the case, to the absence of some clear definite object to be attained. If the insurgents had determined to depose the youth upon the throne as too young to reign, causing him to be superseded by his sister, or if any clearly defined object had been put before them, the probability is that a revolution would have been accomplished. The insurrection in Cornwall and Devon had become formidable, because there was an approximation to this great principle. Through the influence of the monks, the watchword was, "Down with the Reformation!" If the attempt had been to establish a new sect instead of reforming the old Church, the insurrection might not have been unsuccessful. The answer made to the demands of the insurgents was, that abuses only had been removed, and that the Church remained in its corporate capacity, as it had been from the beginning. The consequence was, that the insurgents were compelled to state their grievances in detail; and, even when it was admitted that, on some points, a grievance might be established, it did not follow that the Reformation *in toto* was to be condemned. It was the more easy to put down the insurrections, to which reference has now been made, because, in the counsels of those insurgents, the monastic element prevailed. The majority of those then under arms were willing to give a religious colouring to the movement; but cared little for the enforcement of the demand. Their object was apparently definite, but it was so far

CHAP.  
VII.

Matthew  
Parker.

1559-75.

CHAP.  
VII.Matthew  
Parker.

1559-75.

Kett's in-  
surrection.

from being really such, that they easily yielded to the cajolery of the government.

I have dwelt upon this topic in order to account in some measure for the different result of the rising in Norfolk. Among the followers of Kett there was no absence of religious sentiment or principle; but religion was not then used as the watchword of faction. Although they were not the partizans of Protestantism, they had generally acquiesced in the proceedings of the Reformation. Although the insurrectionary movements were simultaneous in the different parts of the country, the insurgents did not act in concert, and Norfolk and Suffolk had little sympathy with the shires. The object of Kett and his followers was patriotic. They desired to uphold the rights of the lower orders, and to prevent the gentlemen, who had purchased the county estates, from becoming despotic. The citizens of Norwich made no secret of their sympathy with the insurgents, so far as a hatred of the new "gentlemen" was concerned; and many of the landed proprietors, better known from the antiquity of their families than from the number of their acres, were prepared to deal very gently with the outraged poor. Among the followers of Kett, few, if any, of the regular clergy were to be found, and the Anabaptists were scarcely known. The tradesmen of Norwich, as may be instanced in the Parker family, were content, after having realized a competence, to pass the remainder of their days in the society of their old friends, and in the discharge of municipal functions. They were contemned by the wealthier traders, who, coming from a distance, had purchased the old estates of the county families without sharing in that county feeling which, in Norfolk and Suffolk, was especially strong. They shared the indignant feelings of the people when the latter were robbed of their rights, or

what they believed to be such ; when the commons were enclosed ; when the public pastures were converted into private closes ; when the forests were turned into fields ; when the day-labourer was turned from his home, and had to seek wages elsewhere ; when the arable land, on which many had laboured, was turned into the solitary sheep-walk. "Down with the hedges ! Fill the ditches ! Level the enclosures !" This was the general cry. Here something definite was proposed : the people were ready to act ; the neutrals looked on, and, though urged by the government, were not prepared for energetic measures.

At a great annual festival—a "play," as it is called by Holinshed and Hayward—held on the 6th of July, at Wymondham, about six miles from Norwich, the war-cries just described were distinctly heard. A mob had assembled. At the head appeared Robert Kett, or Knight,\* a man of importance in the neighbourhood, a tanner by trade. He was a man of superior intelligence and firmness, one of those who are born to command. The assemblage was addressed by him ; the mob was organized and drilled, and soon assumed the appearance of an army, such as armies then were. The people were irregularly armed, each having seized the weapons which came to hand from gentlemen's houses in the neighbourhood. Their arms, sometimes taken from foes, and sometimes borrowed from friends, consisted of swords, lances, bows, arrows, and even guns. Although defiant of the laws of the land, they could not be regarded as altogether lawless, for a code of laws was extemporized by Kett, and resolutely enforced. Life was secure ; and, although depredation was needful for the support of so

\* The family of Kett is of great antiquity in Norfolk : the name was originally spelt Cat, Chat, Kett, or Knight. See Gurney's "Record of the House of Gournay."



CHAP.  
VII.

Matthew  
Parker.

1559-75.

large a multitude, yet private theft was severely punished. Robert Kett soon found himself at the head of an army of 16,000 men, if reliance may be placed on the figures given by the chroniclers. Huts were erected. A camp was regularly formed. A commissariat was established; and with sheep, cows, and poultry the market was stored. Luxuries even were not wanting, for mention is made of swans; and swans, we may presume, were no ordinary article of food; unless, as is probable, the swans were, in point of fact, only geese under another name. In the middle of a common called Mousehold Hill stood an oak; it was called by the people the Oak of Reformation. Here Robert Kett administered justice, and he was the more particular in treating with impartiality and strictness all who were summoned to his presence, because of the importance of keeping on good terms with the inhabitants of Norwich. The good citizens, at the risk of giving offence to the government, permitted free ingress and egress to and from their town to all parties. The mayor of Norwich and some of the leading magistrates were invited to attend—and did attend—to see justice done, when a trial of more than ordinary importance took place at the Oak of Reformation. In a proclamation issued by Kett, that remarkable man declared, that the people under his command were neither insurgents nor rebels; they were the king's loyal subjects and deputies. Oppressed by the self-constituted "gentlemen," they were in arms, not against the king, but to protect themselves from robbery and wrong. The people, he complained, were now compelled, like beasts of burden, to live on onions and peas, while whole rivers of wealth flowed into the coffers of the landlord. The wealthy and the moneyed men had obtained such power in the state that they ceased to bear their fair proportion of the public burdens,

While the poor were gnawed to the very bones. More of these commonplaces—to which we marvel that a man of Kett's power could condescend—were uttered on the occasion, the real oppression and wrong being in such cases too often lost sight of in the manifest exaggeration of the orator. At this proclamation, however, I merely glance, to show the contrast which it exhibits when compared with similar documents proceeding from the shires." There was no pretext of religion; the insurgents of Norfolk contented themselves with the statement of real, not imaginary, grievances; and yet to the offices of religion more attention was paid in the camp of Robert Kett than has been sometimes found in better disciplined armies. Chaplains of the Reformed Church of England were regularly appointed; and by a chaplain-general, the Rev. Dr. Conyers, vicar of St. Martin's, Norwich, church discipline was maintained. The Oak of Reformation, with outspread branches, served for the cathedral as well as for the hall of justice to "the king's loyal subjects and deputies." Here every morning and evening matins and evensong were duly sung or said, according to the reformed ritual as presented in the Book of Common Prayer. A special prayer was offered by Kett's direction, for the prosperous speed of their enterprise.

CHAP.  
VII.

Matthew  
Parker.  
1559-75.

Dr. Parker was at this time staying with his friends at Norwich. He took a deep interest in what was passing before his eyes; and his conduct on the occasion was characteristic, exhibiting his moral courage, which was often rendered unavailable by the timidity of his character. Daily service was performed in the churches of Norwich, and was attended by many from the camp of the insurgents. Dr. Parker was often seen in the pulpits of the city churches, warning the citizens, who many

CHAP.  
VII.

---

Matthew  
Parker.  
1559-75.

of them sympathized with the insurgents, against the consequences of a breach of the peace. On one occasion, attended by his brother Thomas and other friends, he determined to proceed to Kett's camp, where, while not denying their grievances, he might exhort them to submit their complaints to the proper legal authorities. On arriving at the Oak of Reformation, he found Kett and his counsellors in communication with Thomas Codd, mayor of Norwich, a man who was justly respected for his courage, firmness, and discretion. Kett had pressed him to resign his office of mayor, and to place the keys of the city in Kett's own hands. Codd boldly replied, that he would die first. The people around were in great excitement, clamouring for the mayor's resignation. The weather was exceedingly hot, and many of the people were under the influence of drink. Parker, therefore, thought it useless to address them, and he returned to the city. In the watches of the night, being conscience-stricken, he determined to return to the post of duty; and in the morning, accompanied by his brother, he revisited the camp. Very different was now the state of affairs. The people were on their knees around the oak, responding to the English Litany, which their chaplain, Thomas Conyers, was saying or singing. The Litany finished, Dr. Parker went up to that part of the oak which served for a pulpit or a rostrum. Immediately there was silence throughout the multitude, and he commenced his sermon. Alluding indirectly to the excesses he had witnessed on the preceding day, he exhorted them to temperance and sobriety, and entreated them to regard as God's gift, the provisions with which the camp was stored. He implored them to live at peace one with another; in dealing with their enemies, to guard against the indulgence of any angry and revengeful passions

and, with respect to their prisoners, neither to load them with chains, nor to shed their blood. He called upon them, from regard to the common good, to desist from their present purpose. He urged them to place confidence in any heralds or messengers who might be sent to them by the king ; and to give to the king, young as he was, the honour due to the royal office ; then they might expect that, when he came to riper years, inheriting the valour and prowess of his ancestors, he would restore their rights and defend their liberties.

The preacher was heard with much attention, for he expressed himself with earnestness ; and the doctor was described as “a most charming preacher.” The error committed was, that there was no definite proposition submitted to the meeting ; instead of a discussion, therefore, a pause ensued, of which those who preferred lawlessness with plenty, to work and law, availed themselves. A voice at the outskirts was heard, “How long shall we bear with this hireling doctor ? He is hired by the gentry, and he comes among us with words for which they have paid him ; they have bribed his tongue. For all his prating, we will bridle their intolerable power ; we will hold them bound, spite of their hearts, by the cords of our law.” The demagogue succeeded to a certain extent, for a tumult ensued. Harsh and threatening words were uttered, until at last they reached Parker’s own ears. Some of them are said to have cried out fiercely, “Since he has spoken so finely, and sprinkled his speech with such bitter words and sentences, the best thing to do would be to pierce him with pikes and arrows, and so make him come down.” Parker was considerably alarmed ; he thought the angry multitude intended to kill him on the spot. He said that he felt their spears’ points under his feet. For these apprehensions, however, there was very

CHAP.  
VII.

Matthew  
Parker.

1559-75.



CHAP.  
VII.Matthew  
Parker.

1559-75.

little occasion, for he afterwards discovered that by nearly all the persons under the oak he was highly respected and esteemed, and they were glad that he had ventured into the camp. They had hoped that, influenced by his words, the people would have conducted themselves with greater decorum; and that for their prisoners they would have shown more consideration. A wiser man on this occasion was their chaplain, Thomas Conyers. Disregarding the tumult, he directed the choristers, who had come with him from his church of St. Martin's in the city, to sing the *Te Deum* in English. The people were charmed by the music. Many of them joined in the chorus, and the disturbance was by degrees appeased. Parker availed himself of the interval, descended from the tree, and, with his brother, departed from the camp. They were pursued by some of the discontented insurgents, and were overtaken by them before they reached the Pockthorpe gate. Thinking to convict Parker of an illegal act, they began to question him about his licence as a preacher. Parker having managed to make his escape, left his brother behind him to show that, both from the civil and ecclesiastical authorities, he held a licence.

Parker again took courage, and the next day appeared in St. Clement's church. In the church he was aware that many of the insurgents had assembled with their abettors in the city; and he took occasion, from one of the lessons, to censure the tumult of which he had lately been a witness. No disturbance ensued. The congregation dispersed; but certain of the insurgents waiting at the door, followed him to his house. Here they declared that they knew him to be in possession of three or four good horses—the mode of travelling at that time being on horseback—and they desired him to have them ready, since they were determined, immediately after

linner, to seize them for the service of the king, and to carry them to the camp. Parker received the demand in silence; but he secretly sent for a farrier, and to him he gave directions that, from certain of the horses, the shoes should be taken off, that their hoofs should be pared to the quick, and that all should be rubbed with nerve-oil, to give the appearance of their having been lamed by too much travel and work. The insurgents being deceived, did not molest the grooms as they led the horses to pasture; and Parker soon after left the city for the purpose apparently of taking a walk. At Cringleford Bridge, about two miles from Norwich, he met his horses, mounted, and rode to Cambridge.\*

CHAP.  
VII.

Matthew  
Parker.

1559-75.

Parker's conduct on this occasion made such an impression upon the minds of the leading members of the government, as to cause them to make another proposal to him, that he should engage in public affairs; but he still refused to go to the metropolis. He declared himself to be not a man of action, and that he desired to remain at Cambridge.

Of Parker's life at Cambridge we have already spoken. He stayed there long enough to form friendships with men such as Cecil and Bacon, Smith and Cheke, together with others who, his juniors in age, may have resorted to him at first as a tutor, but were afterwards admitted to his intimacy.

What were the circumstances of Parker's life during the reign of Queen Mary, is a question which can only be answered by a reference to the historical facts and documents within our reach, or open to our inspection. We

Reign of  
Mary.  
1553-58.

\* For an account of Kett's insurrection, see Bloomfield's History of Norfolk, but more particularly "Kett's Rebellion in Norfolk," by the Rev. Frederick William Russell, M.A. This is an historical sketch of considerable value.

CHAP.  
VII.Matthew  
Parker.

1559-75.

must dismiss from our minds, not only the misstatements of Foxe and Burnet, but sometimes even the conjectures of Strype. The Protestant hagiologists are too apt to draw upon their imaginations, and to state as having actually taken place what they, from a party view of the case, suppose to be probable. By such writers we are informed, that Parker underwent the most cruel privations, and a persecution which obliged him to fly from place to place. By Parker's own account, he lived during Mary's reign in great retirement in the house of one of his friends. He led, according to his own statement, a quiet life without any men's aid or succour. Nevertheless he assures us that he was so well contented with his lot, that in that pleasant rest and leisure for his studies, he would never, in respect of himself, have desired any other kind of life, the extreme fear of danger only excepted. His wife he would not be divorced from, or put her away, all this evil time, as he might have done had he desired it, and as he was rigorously required to do.

Of his preferments, he was, of course, as a married clergyman, deprived; but even in this he received some consideration from the authorities, being permitted, on resigning his headship of Corpus Christi College,\* to name his successor. This was done in December, 1553.

Deprived  
of his pre-  
ferments.  
Dec. 1553.April,  
1554.May 21,  
1554.

In April, 1554, he tells us that he was deprived of his prebend in the church of Ely and of his rectory of Landbeach; but here again he was permitted to nominate his successor—William Whalley, a canon of Lincoln. On the 21st of May, 1554, Parker says, "I was despoiled of my deanery of Lincoln, as also, on the same day, of my prebend of Corringham, to which Mr. George Pierpoint was presented by virtue of an advowson of the same granted unto me by the Bishop of Lincoln, J. Turner.

\* Quoted from the College MS. by Strype, i. 63.

The deanery was conferred upon Francis Malet, D.D., by Queen Mary. After this," says Parker, "I lived as a private individual, so happy before God in my conscience, and so far from being either ashamed or dejected, that the delightful literary leisure to which the providence of God called me, yielded me much greater and more solid enjoyments than my former busy and dangerous kind of life ever afforded me. What shall befall me hereafter I know not ; but to God, who cares for all men, and who will one day reveal the secrets of all hearts, I commit myself wholly, and my good and virtuous wife with my two very dear children. And I beseech the same most merciful and almighty God that, for the time to come, we may so bear the reproach of Christ with unbroken courage, as ever to remember here we have no abiding city, but may seek one to come, by the grace and mercy of our Lord Jesus Christ, to whom with the Father and the Holy Ghost be all honour and dominion for ever and ever, Amen." This was written on the 26th of October, 1554, and recurring to what he then said on the 6th of August, 1557, "I persevere," he remarks, "in the same constancy, supported by the grace and goodness of my Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ ; by whose inspiration I have completed a metrical version of the Psalter into the vulgar tongue, and I have written a Defence of the Marriage of Priests against Thomas Martin." In February, 1555, he remarks, "Hitherto so happy before God and content with my own lot have I lived, as neither to envy my superiors nor despise my inferiors ; directing all my efforts to this end — to serve God in a pure conscience, and to be neither despised by those above me, nor feared by those beneath me." Again, on the 14th of October, 1556, "I still live happy, contented with my lot, trusting in the testimony of my conscience in the Lord,

CHAP.  
VII.

Matthew  
Parker.  
1559-75.

Oct. 26  
1554.

Feb. 1555.

Oct. 1556.



CHAP.  
VII.

Matthew  
Parker.

1559-75.

relying on his word, waiting for the redemption of my body, through Christ my Saviour."\*

While denouncing the persecutions which took place at one period of Mary's reign, the unprejudiced reader will probably think that much exaggeration has on this subject prevailed. During the reign of Edward VI. many foreign reformers were invited to England, and many Englishmen, some of them great and good men, were induced to adopt their principles. The great objects of the foreigners were to demolish the Church and to establish a Protestant sect. These were the persons that Mary's government could not tolerate; but, as we have shown in the life of Cranmer, the object of her government, at the commencement of her reign, was to induce these parties to quit the country, and to find their home with the foreign reformers. Here we discover the germ of ultra-Protestantism, Puritanism, and Dissent.

English  
reformers.

There were, at the same time, in England a very different class of reformers, men who refused to separate from the Catholic Church, but were determined, as opportunity should offer, to reform that Church, if not throughout the world, at least in that portion of it in which they were themselves concerned. Such men were Cecil, Bacon, Lord Paget, Roger Ascham, and many others, including Queen Elizabeth herself. They were called Protestants, simply because they protested against the medieval corruptions of the Church and the usurpations of the Pope; in other words, against modern Romanism. They entertained respect for the labours of the foreign reformers, but evinced no sympathy in their work. By Lutherans and by Calvinists, equally, they were distrusted, sometimes courted, but more frequently reviled.†

\* Biographical Memorandums.

† See Zurich Letters, *passim*.

These men, and Matthew Parker was among them, had no inclination to fly the country; and, although their situation in England was precarious and uncomfortable, there was evidently no wish on the part of Mary's government to molest them so long as they kept the peace. This must be evident to every impartial reader who is acquainted with the literature of the period. These men attended the services of the Church with sufficient regularity, although they were prepared, when called to account, to maintain the principles of the Reformation. It is impossible to deny the fact that Queen Elizabeth, Cecil, Bacon, Paget, and most probably Parker, would occasionally be present at the celebration of mass; \*—although, as we find in the reign of Elizabeth, papists received, for a pecuniary compensation, a dispensation from the penalties to which all were subjected by law who did not attend the public service of the Church: so it may have been in the reign of Queen Mary. The difficulty to be encountered by persons in Parker's situation was this, that any informer might hale any one of these

CHAP.  
VII.

Matthew  
Parker.  
1559-75.

\* Of this number was also Dr. Wright, Archdeacon and Vice-chancellor of Oxford. He was an English Reformer, not a foreign Protestant. He was not only tolerated, but he was employed under Mary. He was known to be a reformer, but one who willingly waited to know what kind of reform Pole would offer. He courageously defended the Gospellers, and befriended Jewel.

Among the number of those English Reformers who conformed in the reign of Mary, we may mention an eminent divine, called the Apostle of the North, Bernard Gilpin. He remained in legal possession of the lucrative benefice of Houghton le Spring during the whole of Mary's reign, not without hazard, but in the unrestrained performance of his pastoral duties. He had a powerful protector in his relation and friend Dr. Tunstall, Bishop of Durham; but the bishop was quite aware that Gilpin protested against the dogma of transubstantiation; and the bishop himself freely censured Pope Innocent III. for dictating a belief in it to be essential to salvation.

CHAP.  
VII.Matthew  
Parker.

1559-75.

occasional conformists before the ecclesiastical judge. When thus forced upon their trial, the ecclesiastical judge might compel the accused to criminate himself, by commanding him to exhibit a confession of faith, or to declare his acceptance of the dogma of transubstantiation. It is to the uncertainty and constant anxiety arising from this circumstance, that Parker alludes as the single drawback to the happiness he enjoyed during his sequestration in Mary's reign. Of the annoyances to which men were sometimes subjected by the petifogging *employés* of the ecclesiastical courts, we have had occasion to speak before at some length. It was the first grievance that gave an impulse to the reformation movement in England. In the reign of Henry VIII., the powers of the ecclesiastical court were curtailed; but it is certain that some of the abuses still remained; and, to this circumstance, we may probably attribute much of the persecution which disgraced a portion of Mary's reign. Men who had no interest to protect them at court were accused, provoked, and having exasperated their judges by the manner in which they honestly defended their opinions, were cruelly condemned.

The more distinguished among the laymen were not only protected, but were actually employed by Mary's government. In the life of Pole we have seen how the deputation, sent to invite him to England, consisted of men who, like Parker, while regarding themselves as Catholics, did not conceal their inclination to Protestantism, or their desire to effect a reform in the Church. The difference in point of principle between them and the exiles was, that while these desired a reform of the Church, the others meant, by a reformation, the changes instituted by Luther, or Zwingli, or Calvin. For a reform, Pole, as we have seen, was himself prepared.

As to those readers who are not well acquainted with the literature of the period, but depend upon the assertions of Foxe and Burnet, what has just been advanced will appear contradictory to their preconceived opinions, I will refer, as confirmatory of the surmises now made with respect to Parker's position, to the life and correspondence of his friend, Roger Ascham.\*

CHAP.  
VII.

Matthew  
Parker.

1559-75.

Roger Ascham was well known to be a reformer. He had been appointed, when in Germany, secretary to Edward VI. On his return to England, on the death of the king, he was surprised to find that, by the intervention of Bishop Gardiner and Lord Paget, he was permitted to retain his office at the court of Queen Mary, with a salary of forty marks. Certain other perquisites were conceded to him. Writing to Thorne from Greenwich, in 1555, he informs his correspondent, "all that the former kings, Henry and Edward, bestowed upon me, has been restored and doubled. I have been made secretary for the Latin tongue to the king and queen; and I would not change it, so help me Christ, for any other way of life that could be offered me. Stephen, Bishop of Winchester, Lord High Chancellor of England, has patronized me with the greatest kindness and favour, so that I cannot easily determine whether Paget was more ready to

Roger  
Ascham.

\* See the whole works of Roger Ascham, now first collected and revised, with a life of the author, by the Rev. Dr. Giles. I add the following from Dr. Carwithen: "With a few exceptions their departure was voluntary; for, by a prudent and inoffensive demeanour, many laics were unmolested, even in the open profession of the reformed faith. Ascham, whose opinions were not disguised, enjoyed, by the favour of Gardiner, not only security, but an honourable station, because he was contented to remain in his own country without disturbing its government; while Cheke, who thought to preserve his conscience by flight, was seized in Flanders, compelled to a recantation, and died from the pangs of remorse." Hist. of the Church of England, i. 488.



CHAP.  
VII.

Matthew  
Parker.

1559-75.

recommend me, or Winchester to protect and exalt me. There have not been wanting some who have endeavoured to hinder the flow of his benevolence towards me *on account of my religion*; but they have not succeeded. I owe much, therefore, to the kindness of Winchester (Bishop Gardyner),\* and I willingly own it. Not only I, but many others have felt his humane consideration." Ascham is said to have been not only protected by the officers of state, but to have been favoured and countenanced by the queen herself; and, in fact, remarks his biographer, he seems to have been as much a favourite at court, as if he had been the staunchest of papists. With Cardinal Pole, Ascham was a great favourite, and, by the cardinal, Ascham was employed to translate into Latin a speech made by him before the English Parliament. Grant, writing at a time when the transactions of Queen Mary's reign must have been well remembered, mentions that Ascham always made open profession of the reformed religion; at the same time, he admits that suspicions, and charges of temporizing and compliance, had somewhat sullied his reputation. I lay these facts before the reader, and I leave it to him to reconcile them with statements elsewhere made.

In the reign of Queen Mary, it is stated by Foxe, Strype, and Burnet, that Parker underwent the most cruel privations, and a persecution which obliged him to fly from

\* Gardyner was evidently a man who resented opposition to his will. To the courteous Ascham, he could be gracious; but to Sir John Cheke and others, who opposed him in his despotic endeavours to force a particular pronounciation of the Greek language on the University of Cambridge, he could be relentless. Cheke was subjected to the usual process which was adopted against those who gave offence to the government. He was compelled to a recantation. Being accused, he was,—in the refusal of the government to interpose,—without a protector

place to place. It is further stated, that at one time in this reign, a "narrow search was made for him, which he, having some notice of, fled in the night in great peril, and got a fall from his horse, so dangerously that he never recovered it." The question arises, When did this accident occur? We have already read of Parker's peace and happiness during the years 1554, 1555, and 1556: he could hardly have failed to mention the disturbance of that peace and happiness if the search and flight had occurred in any of these years. If the accident had happened during the last months of Cardinal Pole's administration, we may be sure that, instead of being concealed, the fact would have been referred to by his friends, as giving him a claim to consideration on the accession of Queen Elizabeth. Instead of this, the accident occurred under circumstances of which Parker was evidently ashamed. In a letter to Sir Nicolas Bacon, in the year 1558-9, in which he urges his reasons for declining the episcopate, he employs these remarkable words: "To come to another consideration of a further imperfection, *which I would have dissembled to you and others*; but it cannot be; I must open it to you, my asured good master and friend, in secresy. . . . In one of my letters I made a little signification of it; but, peradventure, ye did not mark it." What the secret was, he goes on to state in ambiguous terms: "Flying," he says, "in a night, from such as sought for me to my peril, I fell off my horse so dangerously that I shall never recover it."\* We have here the fact that the accident did really occur: we have the further fact, that it took place under circumstances of which Parker was ashamed, or desired the concealment. The question is, Was there an event in his life which, on the accession of Queen Elizabeth, as well as during the reign of her

CHAP.  
VII.Matthew  
Parker.  
1559-75.Parker's  
accident.

\* Corresp. p. 58; Strype, i. 64.

CHAP.  
VII.

Matthew  
Parker.

1559-75.

sister, it was politic to conceal? To such an event we can undoubtedly refer.

At the time of Edward the Sixth's death, Parker was enjoying his *otium cum dignitate* at Cambridge. But the news of the demise of the crown must have filled him with anxiety, for every one knew that the accession of Mary would impede the progress of the Reformation. Parker, as we have seen, never mingled in the politics of the day, and he received with complacency, rather than with the zeal of a partizan, the report that the late king, with the advice of his privy council and the sanction of the Archbishop of Canterbury, Dr. Cranmer, had set aside the claims of the daughters of Henry VIII., and had appointed the Lady Jane to be his successor. News, at that time, did not fly fast, and the provinces were greatly influenced by what took place in the metropolis. The authorities at Cambridge had not determined upon their course of action. When the Duke of Northumberland, as the representative of the government, appeared at the city gates, he required, in the name of the government, that measures should be instantly adopted for the proclamation of Queen Jane. To Dr. Parker, as to other leading men in the university, the duke sent an invitation requesting them to sup with him on the evening of his arrival, Saturday, the 15th of July. Dr. Parker accepted the invitation, and met at supper Dr. Sandys, the vice-chancellor, Dr. Bill, and the master of St. John's, Mr. Lever. These were zealous supporters of Queen Jane. Parker, by not opposing the proposed measures, was supposed to have acquiesced in them. On the Sunday, the vice-chancellor preached; and there was considerable excitement among all classes of the people. Parker watched the progress of events with his usual caution, not to say timidity, and remained, as much as possible, in

Proclama-  
tion at  
Cam-  
bridge of  
Queen  
Jane.  
July 15,  
1553.

retirement. He saw the duke on the 17th marching to Bury, where he expected to receive reinforcements. For reinforcements there was a necessity, as there was no enthusiasm among his soldiers; and there was, from some cause or other, a reaction with the mob. His soldiers were deserting, and he was himself disappointed and dispirited. He returned to Cambridge on the 18th, and received intelligence on the 19th, that Mary had been proclaimed in London as the undoubted queen of this realm.\* On the 20th, the Duke of Northumberland, demented by his fears, proclaimed Queen Mary at the Market Cross in Cambridge. Of the members of the university, some fled in alarm from the city, and those who remained used their influence to persuade the people, at first favourable to Jane, to espouse the cause of Mary, in whose favour a reaction had taken place. Dr. Sandys and Dr. Bill were both of them insulted in the regent's house, and the former was sent a prisoner to the Tower of London.

But where, all this time, was Dr. Parker? We know how easily he was alarmed, and for alarm there was now just cause. After his attendance on the Duke of Northumberland at supper, his name is not mentioned. Although he had not openly sent in his adhesion to the government of Queen Jane, he certainly had not come forward as a loyal subject of Queen Mary. If he had asserted the rights of Mary when Northumberland arrived at Cambridge, he would have had nothing to fear from the mob. It was now only known that he had been present at the Duke of Northumberland's supper; and whether he were silent on that occasion or not, by outsiders he was regarded as a partizan of Jane. Against him, therefore, the angry passions of the populace were directed. He fled, escaping with difficulty; and if we may hazard

CHAP.

VII.

Matthew  
Parker.

1559-75.

\* Stow's Annals, p. 612.



CHAP.  
VII.

Matthew  
Parker.  
1559-75.

a conjecture as to the time and circumstances of his fall from his horse, when flying by night, in peril, and pursued by his opponents, he fractured his leg, we may refer to the facts just stated; and perhaps we shall not be far wrong if we come to the conclusion, that it was at this time that the accident occurred, the cause of which Parker desired to keep secret.

It is most probable, that Parker's usual caution prevented him from acquiescing openly in the claims of the Lady Jane. At the same time, he had not declared manfully in the cause of Queen Mary. The cause of Mary was, in this case, identified with that of Elizabeth; hence we see that, in both reigns, there was ample reason for circumspection and reticence.

Parker's  
character.

We have now followed Matthew Parker through the earlier portion of his career. We have seen the training he providentially received for the great work to which he was about to be called. It may not be inexpedient here to pause, that we may take a view of his character, as impartially given by two eminent writers, who, although they differed in many of their opinions, were equally capable of arriving at a conclusion, which is worthy of the attention of all who, in considering a great man's character, would weigh fairly his advantages and difficulties, his merits and defects. Dr. Cardwell, in speaking of Parker, describes him as "a man of learning, of moderation, of system, and of piety, cautious in the formation of his opinions, and firm in maintaining them; but he was retiring in his habits, slow in his apprehensions, and disqualified for public speaking." He continues to observe, "that, in his general habits of prudence and moderation, there were two other points which would be thought likely, at that critical period, to qualify him for the exercise of Church authority. He had a

profound respect for the prerogative of the crown, and dreaded the *Germanical natures*, as he styled them, of the English exiles.”\* Archdeacon Hardwick, a discriminating historian, describes Matthew Parker as one “who, by nature and by education, by the ripeness of his learning, the sobriety of his judgment, and the incorruptness of his private life, was eminently fitted for the task of ruling in the Church of England, through a stormy period of her history; and, though he was seldom able to reduce conflicting elements of thought and feeling into active harmony, yet the vessel he was called to pilot has been saved almost entirely by his skill from breaking on the rock of medieval superstitions, or else drifted far away into the whirlpool of licentiousness and unbelief. † . . . . He was intimately acquainted with the records of the ancient Church, and uniformly based his vindication of our own upon its cordial adherence to the primitive faith, and to the practice of the purest ages. His great skill in antiquity, to quote the language of Strype, reached to ecclesiastical matters as well as historical; whereby he became acquainted with the ancient liturgies and doctrines of the Christian Church in former times. He utterly disliked, therefore, the public offices of the present Roman Church, because they ‘varied so much from the ancient.’ On addressing ‘the expelled’ bishops in 1560, Parker himself wrote: ‘Pray behold, and see how we of the Church of England, reformed by our late King Edward and his clergy, and now by her majesty and

CHAP.  
VII.Matthew  
Parker.

1559-75.

\* Cardwell’s Common Prayer, p. 13.

† “These times,” Parker himself writes, “are troublesome. The Church is sore assaulted, but not so much of open enemies, who can less hurt, as of pretended favourers and false brethren, *who, under the colour of reformation, seek the ruin and subversion both of learning and religion.*” Corresp. p. 434.

CHAP.  
VII.  
Matthew  
Parker.  
1559-75.

hers reviving the same, have but imitated and followed the example of the ancient and worthy fathers.’\* In his last will Parker declared, ‘I profess that I do certainly believe and hold whatsoever the holy Catholic Church believeth and receiveth in any articles whatsoever pertaining to faith, hope, and charity, in the whole sacred Scripture.’”†

We have reason to bless the providence of God who, in Queen Elizabeth and her primate, raised up for us, in the most critical period of our Church’s history, two persons, who, in spite of their faults or defects, were enabled to see with clearness through the surrounding gloom, and to steer the ship into a port where the waters, if not as calm and still as could have been wished, could no longer be destructive.

Of the faults of Elizabeth we shall have often to speak ; of his own defects, Parker shall speak for himself. Of himself he gives the following characteristic account in a private letter to Cecil : “I cannot be quiet till I have disclosed to you, as to one of my best willing friends, in secrecy, mine imperfection ; which grieveth me not so much to utter in respect of my own rebuke, as it grieveth me that I am not able to answer your friendly report of me before time ; whereby, to my much grief of heart, I pass forth my life in heaviness, being thus intruded, notwithstanding my reluctance by oft letters to my friends, to be in such room, which I cannot sustain agreeably to the honour of the realm, if I should be so far tried. The truth is, what with passing those hard years of Mary’s reign in obscurity, without all conference, or such manner of study, as now might do me service, and what with my natural vitiosity of overmuch shamefacedness, I am

\* Corresp. p. 111.

† Hardwick on the Articles, p. 117.

so abashed in myself, that I cannot raise up my heart and stomach to utter in talk with other, which (as I may saye) with my pen I can express indifferently, without great difficulty; and again, I am so evil acquainted with strangers, both in their manner of utterance of their speech, and also in such foreign affairs, that I cannot win of myself any ways to satisfy my fancy in such kind of entertainments.”\*

CHAP.  
VII.

Matthew  
Parker.

1559-75.

I have made these quotations from my desire to afford the reader some insight into Parker's character before we enter upon his history as a public man. His faults as well as his virtues, his weakness of temper as well as the firmness of his principles, left an impress upon the Church in the reformation of which he sustained so conspicuous a part. He informs us, in his diary, that a “Defence of the Marriage of Priests,” in answer to Thomas Martin, occupied a portion of his time during Queen Mary's reign. Of this work, however, he was the editor, rather than the author. Who the author was, I do not know. The work was probably revised by Parker to a considerable extent, and at the end of the treatise were added ten sheets of Parker's own composition. In this, which may be regarded as an appendix to the work, Parker gives a concise history of the marriage and celibacy of the clergy of the Church of England, from the first introduction of Christianity to his own time.

He employed himself also on a metrical version of the Psalms. Of his version of Psalm xcii. I give the following specimen :—

\* Corresp. p. 199.



CHAP.  
VII.

Matthew  
Parker.  
1559-75.

THE ARGUMENT.

*Of Sabbath day, the solemn feast  
Doth us excite by rest,  
God's mighty works that we declare,  
Love him for all the best.*

*Bonum est confiteri.*

A joyful thing for man it is,  
The Lord to celebrate ;  
To thy good name, O God, so high !  
Due lauds to modulate.

To preach and show thy gentleness  
In early morning light ;  
Thy truth of word to testify,  
All whole by length of night.

Upon the psalm, the decachord,  
Upon the pleasant lute,  
On sounding, good, sweet instruments,  
With shaumes, with harp, with flute.

For thou hast joyed my fearful heart,  
O Lord ! thy works to see ;  
And I with praise will just rejoice  
These handy-works of Thee.

How glorious, O blessed Lord !  
Be these, the facts of thine ;  
Thy thoughts be deep, thy counsels high,  
Inscrutable, divine.

The true elect, and righteous man  
Shall flourish like the palm ;  
As cedar tree in Libanus,  
Himself shall spread with balm.

Deep planted they, in roots alway,  
In God's sweet house to bide ;  
Shall flourish like, in both the courts  
Of this our God and guide.

CHAP.  
VII.  
Matthew  
Parker.  
1559-75.

In age most sure, they shall increase  
Their fruit abundantly ;  
Well liking they, and fat shall be,  
To bear most fruitfully.

That is to say, they out shall preach  
This Lord's true faithfulness,  
Who is my strength and mighty rock,  
Who hates unrighteousness.

## CHAPTER VIII.

## FROM THE DEATH OF MARY TO THE ELECTION OF PARKER.

Position of Parker on the accession of Elizabeth.—The great parties in the country.—The Reformers.—The Exiles.—Anabaptists and Lollards.—Papists.—Condition of the clergy.—Character of Elizabeth.—Policy of the government.—Conduct of the pope.—Coronation of Elizabeth.—Parker summoned to London.—Liturgical Reforms.—Act of Uniformity.—Act of Supremacy.—Spoliation Act.—Westminster Conference.—Diocesans summoned before the Privy Council.—Reception of the Prayer Book.—The regular clergy advocates of the papal supremacy.—The secular clergy in favour of the Reformation.—Apostolical Succession.—Primacy offered to Parker.—Refused.—Offered to Dr. Wotton.—Offered to Feckenham.—Parker nominated primate.—His letter to the queen.—His election.—Commissions for his confirmation.—Difference between valid and legal consecration.—Number of officiating bishops to make a consecration legal.—Parker's confirmation.—Letter of the emperor to the queen.—Petition of the Puritans.—Court of High Commission.—Preparations for Parker's consecration.—William Barlow chosen to preside.—His history.—Co-operating bishops.—The consecration.—Appendix.

CHAP.  
VIII.

Matthew  
Parker.  
1559-75.

DURING the reign of Queen Mary, Parker had been living on his capital, and, at the period of Elizabeth's accession, his means were nearly exhausted. He had in hand money equivalent to about three hundred pounds of the present currency. He was anxious, of course, to be restored to the preferments he had forfeited; but it was a time of considerable anxiety, for Parker was well aware, that Elizabeth was obstinately opposed to the marriage of the clergy, and he was resolute in his determination not only not to be separated from his family, but,

Com-  
mence-  
ment of  
Elizabeth's  
reign.

To crave fit disposition for my wife ;  
Due reference of place and exhibition,  
With such accommodation, and besort,  
As levels with her breeding.\*

CHAP.  
VIII.

Matthew  
Parker.  
1559-75.

He had now two sons,† whom he regarded with parental pride and fondness. He thought fit, therefore, to “bide his time” and to remain in retirement. He possessed the means, with great economy, of supporting himself for a year or two, until the affairs of the Church should be settled. His brother, Thomas Parker, was a thriving tradesman ; and he had a wise adviser in his half-brother, Baker. The family was a united family ; and the only cause of anxiety, which had lately existed in the chance of his being haled by a common informer or by an enemy before an ecclesiastical court, was now removed.

The position of the government was one of great difficulty ; and the difficulty of understanding that position becomes the greater, from the fact that many historians, employing the modern nomenclature, divide the country at this period into two great parties, with their principles clearly defined. The truth is, as may be gathered from what has been before stated, that there at this time existed in the country several parties diametrically opposed in fundamental principles, even when they were prevailed upon, as was sometimes the case, to act in concert.

There was the great body of English reformers, practical men, whose object was, not to establish a school of thought, but simply to correct abuses in the Church ; not to introduce new doctrines, but to return from medieval fables to primitive truth. We have already mentioned,

English  
reformers.

\* Othello, act I., sc. 3.

† He had had four sons ; of these two were taken from him soon after their birth.



CHAP.  
VIII.  
Matthew  
Parker.  
1559-75.

as belonging to this party, the queen herself, together with Cecil, Sir Thomas Smith, Sir Ralph Sadler, Dr. Walter Haddon, and all those who, in the first privy council of Queen Elizabeth, were characterized as reformers. They had, many of them, occasionally conformed in Mary's reign, because they knew, that although there were very serious differences between them and the papists, yet if these were for a season allowed to lie in abeyance, and if minor reforms were gradually introduced, they would win to their side not a few of those who were now opposed to them. We need not say more upon this point, having enlarged upon it in the preceding chapter. These men, at the accession of Queen Elizabeth, assumed a position from which they were soon driven: their desire having been, in the first instance, to bring back ecclesiastical affairs to the condition in which they had been left at the close of Henry VIII.'s reign, and thence to proceed, with more or less of rapidity, in effecting systematically the reform of the Catholic Church in this realm.

Exiles.

In their scheme they were thwarted, and their wise measures were not unfrequently frustrated by the opposition they had to encounter, from what may be regarded as the second great party—that of the Exiles. These persons contemned the moderation of the English reformers; and had associated with those foreigners who were so unwisely invited into the country in the reign of King Edward. For English institutions the foreigners entertained not the slightest affection or respect. In the oldest and noblest of the institutions inherited from our ancestors—the Church of England—they actually desired the demolition of all but its revenues. They had been, many of them, consulted on its reformation by such men as Cranmer, but with nothing less than a revolution would

they be content. They thought not of cleansing the ancient fabric, but they desired to establish a sect upon its ruins; and their sectarianism having passed through Lutheranism into Zwinglianism, settled down at last into Calvinism.

CHAP.  
VIII.

Matthew  
Parker.  
1559-75.

A third party consisted of the remnant of the ancient Lollards, who had merged imperceptibly into the Anabaptists; their political principles being nearly identical. Both to the English reformers and also to the party of the exiles, the Anabaptists stood opposed. Animated by sentiments of a revolutionary character, their profession of religion was generally a pretext; while to the statesmen it certainly appeared that they sought the overthrow of the Church, only as a step towards the demolition of the throne.

Anabap-  
tists and  
Lollards.

A fourth,—a very small party,—consisted of those who were simply papists, who desired the re-establishment of papal supremacy, and, in point of doctrine, were ready to receive the dogmas of Trent, as they were gradually propounded or decided.

Papists.

While on this subject, we must pause to correct another misrepresentation of the Puritan writers, when they affirm, without shadow of proof, that the clergy generally were papists at heart, and came into the Reformation with great reluctance; an assertion which charity is slow to accept, since it would insinuate that, out of a body of more than 10,000 men, almost all were hypocrites and cowards. If they had been papists at heart—a fact which none but the Searcher of hearts can know—they belied the traditionary feeling of centuries. The secular clergy had for centuries murmured at the papal usurpations; and we may infer from the legislation of synods and councils, that they submitted with reluctance to the imposition of ceremonies, which seemed, during every cen-

Condition  
of the  
clergy.

CHAP.  
VIII.Matthew  
Parker.

1559-75.

ture, to increase. From this allegation the Regulars are of course excluded. The Regulars were called the pope's militia; and the histories of the various great monasteries, of late brought to light, serve to show how vehement their desire was to transfer their allegiance from the long-established hierarchy of the Church of England to a foreign master. These were the clergy who were ready to organize and conduct the various insurrections in the time of Henry and Edward; and among the Regulars, to their eternal disgrace it must be recorded, were found too many who, coming from foreign parts, were only prevented by lack of opportunity from becoming the assassins of Queen Elizabeth. But it is to be remembered, that the Regulars had been deprived and deposed before the accession of Elizabeth; for the few monastic restorations in the time of Mary are not worthy of notice. Some of the Regulars, by assuming the character of secular priests, occasionally obtained possession of preferments in the Church; but these were exceptional cases, not noted by the historian. The clergy who remained were Seculars, always opposed to the pope, as far as they dared to oppose him, and in a state of chronic hostility to the monks. They were at this time generally in favour of the royal supremacy; and although many were not sufficiently learned or well informed to appreciate, to its full extent, the merit of those changes which had taken place in our formularies, yet they acquiesced in the mandates of their ecclesiastical superiors, when these were backed by the authority of the sovereign. Slow and unwilling the older men were to learn a new lesson; and to this unwillingness may be generally traced the occasional omissions in regard to the new service book. What the royal and episcopal visitors complained of was, not wilful opposition, but neg-

ligence ; many of the clergy would retain the old mumpsimus, not from opposition to the orthodox sumpsimus, but because they would avoid the trouble of making a change in books to the handling of which they had been accustomed from their youth. The ignorance among some of the lower class of clergy was such, that they trusted, in the performance of the divine offices, more to the memory than to the eye. They found it difficult to read the new offices, and they would sometimes prefer the repetition of the old office which they knew, to a learning by heart of the new which they knew not. So far were they from evincing a desire to return to the former state of things, that, in spite of these inconveniences, they progressed, as rapidly as could be expected, in the line of the Reformation ; for, at the end of ten years, the Pope, from want of sympathizers among the English clergy, was obliged to create a schism, and send a special mission to this country. This mission itself failed in its object, because, during those ten years, England had become decidedly Protestant—so Protestant that the representatives of “ the Exiles ” possessed a large party in the country, as hostile to the English reformation as were the papists themselves, by representing the English reformers as not sufficiently Protestant. If the clergy had been, as they are frequently represented to have been, inimical or permanently indifferent to the Reformation, there would have been no need of that Jesuit mission which the Bishop of Rome sent into England. The acquiescence of the clergy in the reforming measures of the Church, receives a still further indirect proof from the fact, that, among the leading dignitaries of the Church, there were some who would have encouraged them to resistance. Archbishop Heath, and the bishops who acted with him, would not have retired

CHAP.  
VIII.

Matthew  
Parker.

1559–75.



CHAP.  
VIII.

Matthew  
Parker.

1559-75.

so quietly as they did from their preferments, if they had not become quite aware that, in a resistance to the government, they could depend on scarcely any support from their clergy. We shall have occasion hereafter to show, that although they thought it due to the dignity of their character to resign their sees, they were, many of them, by no means opposed to such a reformation as would, if taken in time, have satisfied the English reformers.

Queen  
Elizabeth.

Having given a brief sketch of the great parties\* which met the government of Elizabeth on her first coming to the throne, it is important that I should lay before the reader the opinion which I have formed of the great queen's character; for it is to be remembered, that Elizabeth *ruled* as well as *reigned*, and thus became, not only the queen of the realm, but a party in the state.

Of the character of Queen Elizabeth, a view too favourable may, at one time, have been adopted by a nation grateful for the benefits she had conferred upon it: in the present age, on the contrary, a pleasure seems to be taken, which may almost be described as malignant, in vilifying the private character of a vain woman, in order to detract from the marvellous powers of mind exhibited by—the solecism will be pardoned—a female statesman, in whose reign England was raised from a second-rate power to the high position among the kingdoms of the earth, which the nation has ever since sustained. The merits of Queen Elizabeth as a politician and statesman are summed up by Camden, in the remark:

\* The great body of clergy and laity described in the preceding paragraph, were not formed into a party; they did not act in concert; they were not Papists and Protestants, but Medievalists with Protestant proclivities.

“Let her noble actions recommend her to the praise and admiration of posterity: religion reformed; peace established; money reduced to its true value; a most complete fleet built; our naval glory restored; England, for forty years, most prudently governed, enriched, and strengthened; Scotland rescued from the French; France itself relieved; the Netherlands supported; Spain awed; Ireland quieted.” He adds as a climax, what in these days would be regarded as scarcely worthy of notice, “the whole world sailed round.” To this we may further add, without seeking to justify, or even to palliate, the tyranny and passion with which she effected her objects, she pursued with success the policy of her grandfather, in repressing the almost regal power of the nobles, and in elevating the commercial aristocracy of the land. When to her moral character and that of her court reference is made, we must not leave out of our consideration the spirit of the age and the character of the times. Society was, at that period, in a transitional state. It was passing from the unreality of a worn-out age of chivalry, without having yet reached the point of modern refinement. In external things there was much of pomp and ceremony; but the grossness of vice was not concealed when the pressure of ceremony was withdrawn. There was much magnificence with little elegance; much of grandeur, but little of comfort; a superfluity of ridiculous sentiment combined with actual licentiousness. There was courtesy, on the part of courtiers, towards their equals; but, upon their vindictive passions, by these very persons no restraint was placed, when those passions were roused against an enemy or an inferior. The nobles and the men of the middle class, though frequently at variance with one another, were united too often in the oppression of the lower orders.

CHAP.  
VIII.

Matthew  
Parker.

1559-75.

CHAP.  
VIII.Matthew  
Parker.

1559-75.

When, over a society so composed—split into factions, religious and political, and open to the threats and manœuvres of Spain and France—a young woman, at first almost unbefriended, was called upon to preside, the marvel is, not that she should occasionally err, but that she should come forth acknowledged by her contemporaries as one of the wisest statesmen of an age abounding with great characters.

If libels, gossip, and caricatures are to be regarded in the light of historical documents, no historical character can be protected against the envy and misrepresentations to which, whoever is eminent in any of the various departments of human exertion, will, in an evil world, be exposed. Prominence in position provokes attack. If, on such authorities as those to which allusion has been made, we were to rely, the purest and most amiable of the present generation might be handed down to posterity, the very opposite in appearance to what he is in reality.

We must reprobate the attempt frequently made to blacken the character of Queen Elizabeth, by the republication of the scandalous chronicles of her age. At all events, these statements should be qualified, if not contradicted, by the testimony borne to the excellence of Elizabeth's character, by the great writers who shed lustre upon the Elizabethan era,—poets, historians, divines, philosophers, including Shakspeare and Spenser, Bacon, Burghley, Hayward, Camden, and Hooker. They do not hesitate to admit and to lament the frivolities, the absurdities, the indiscretions of the woman; but, admitting this, we must observe that of the indecent stories, on which persons of a stern morality, if not of deep religious feeling, delight to dwell, most of them are to be traced to the scandalous correspondence of foreign ambassadors with

their respective courts, when it was the policy of those courts to create a prejudice against the queen; or else they may be traced to the libels industriously circulated by Jesuits and Seminary priests.

CHAP.  
VIII.

Matthew  
Parker.  
1559-75.

With respect to the scandals circulated in foreign courts, we have no less an authority than that of Catherine de Medici herself, to affirm that they were easily accepted, but never believed. We have the still stronger testimony of the French ambassador, Michael de Castelnau, to the same effect. This personage had been much in England; he was in close and confidential correspondence with Mary Queen of Scots; and while his diplomatic relations were with the enemies of Elizabeth, he was, at the same time, so familiar with her court, her favourites, and her nobles, that he must have known almost all that could be known of her secret history. Therefore we may attach no ordinary credit to his assertions, when, convinced of the untruth of the defamatory stories so industriously propagated, he went out of his way to leave the following honourable and decisive testimony to the character of the queen: "If some persons have wished to tax her memory with having amorous attachments, I will say with truth that they are inventions forged by the malevolent, and from the cabinets of ambassadors, to avert from an alliance with her those to whom it would have been useful." This was written by him in his private memoirs, when he could have had no possible motive for defending the queen, or for making a statement which was not true.

As regards the principle upon which the Jesuits and papists acted, it is unintentionally, but very clearly, revealed to us by no less a person than Cardinal Allen. Speaking of Elizabeth, he says: "She is a caitiff, under God's and holy Church's curse, given up to a reprobate mind, and



CHAP.  
VIII.Matthew  
Parker,  
1559-75.

*therefore* " (let the conclusion be compared with the premises), and *therefore* " her open enormities and her secret sins must be great and not numerable." The cardinal might have added another *therefore*; and might with equal force have affirmed, that, because these sins must have existed in this caitiff, though they cannot be discovered, yet they may be imagined; and *therefore* the inventions of a prurient imagination have been handed down to posterity as historical statements.

Cardinal Allen has a bad pre-eminence in the art of lying; but he was surpassed by Sanders, of whose veracity we may judge, when we find him repeatedly asserting, that, in the English Prayer Book, the devotions offered by the papists to the Virgin Mary are tendered to Queen Elizabeth.

A well-informed writer, who has thoroughly examined the subject, has with great accuracy and ability traced to their source the stories impeaching the queen's morality, which have been stereotyped for the use of careless or partial historians, male and female. Having verified his references, I have no hesitation in endorsing his conclusions, when he proves them to rest upon a countess whose "naturel" was notorious, and who at least on one occasion made a public confession of lying; upon an ambassador, whose secretary ran away from him on account of his abhorrence of his system of lying; upon a Scotch courtier, who made a boast to his court of his success in lying; upon a groom, who was pilloried for lying; upon an unknown rogue, whose ears were cut off for lying; upon another, whose words were so shocking, that the magistrates were ashamed to write them down; upon two murderers; and, finally, upon Cardinal Allen and Dr. Sanders.\*

Whether it be more reasonable to give credit to the

\* See Fraser's Magazine, Nov. 1853, where will be found the authorities for these statements.

assertion of persons known to be liars and libellers in the age in which they wrote, or to suppose all that England held in every rank of life, and in every department of literature, in the most celebrated epoch of our country's history, to have been flatterers, sycophants, and worse caitiffs than the worst of women could have been, may at least admit of a doubt.

One other argument in her favour I cannot forbear to produce. Her three favourites, about whom scandal has been most busy, were Leicester, Hatton, and Essex; and these three men were victims of her tyranny as well as of her affection. Leicester had often to tremble under her capricious disposition; the last days of Hatton were embittered by her bringing against him a charge of peculation; Essex died on the scaffold. When favourites have at any time secrets to divulge, they invariably become the tyrants of the sovereigns who place themselves in their power; their silence is purchased by unworthy concessions unwillingly made.

Upon the whole, the reader would not be far wrong who should give credit to any amount of indiscretion on the part of Elizabeth, in social and private life; but if he sifts the evidence adduced by her most bitter enemies, he will repudiate the charges brought against her morality—with which, after all, we are only then concerned—when it can be proved that they influenced her conduct as a queen.

We must here pause again to remind the reader, that Elizabeth is not to be regarded as a constitutional sovereign, dependent upon the advice of responsible ministers. Throughout her life she was her own prime minister; and some of the worst instances of her vulgarity and insolence upon record may evidently be traced to her determination to show, that although, as she re-

CHAP.  
VIII.

Matthew  
Parker.

1559-75.

CHAP.  
VIII.Matthew  
Parker.  
1559-75.

marked, "she had but the body of a weak and feeble woman, she had nevertheless the heart and stomach of a king, aye, and of a king of England too." There may have been something of policy as well as of passion in the oaths she occasionally uttered, and the violence of action to which she sometimes condescended. She was proud of being able to swear like a king. Cecil was not a minister in the same sense as Chatham, Pitt, Peel, or Gladstone. Although Elizabeth was guided by his wisdom and influenced by his counsel, Cecil was made to keep his distance as a servant of the crown, and was careful, as her confidential secretary, to let it be known, that the policy of his government depended, not on his own will, but on that of the queen. What is mentioned by the great Lord Bacon in commendation of Cecil, would be produced as an impeachment against a modern minister: "having given advice when asked, Cecil rested on such conclusions as her majesty in her own will determined, and then did his best to carry them into effect. In great matters she would defer to him; in minor matters she took pleasure in showing her independence, sometimes to the detriment of the public service."

When seated on her throne, when presiding at the council board, or when conversing with the agents of diplomacy, Elizabeth would put forth such masculine powers of mind, as not only to astonish the illustrious statesmen, whom her sagacity had called to her counsels, but to compel foreign ministers, such as the illustrious Sully himself, to acknowledge and declare that, even in her old age, she held, and deserved to hold, among the politicians of the day, the highest place.

But with her robes of office, Elizabeth seemed too often to put off her better self; and, when she descended from her throne, she not unfrequently fell as much below the



level of her own sex, as on other occasions she rose above it. She unwisely disregarded the conventionalities of society ; and the frivolities—tolerated in a young woman by astonished statesmen—being persevered in when an unacknowledged old age crept upon her, she became an object of ridicule to many whose sardonic smiles belied the flattery of their lips. There sometimes seemed to be an ingrained malignity in her very nature, which found pleasure in giving pain, or in causing annoyance, in little things. After accepting the advice of her councillors in Church or State, she would sometimes find a perverse pleasure in making the performance of their duty as irksome and difficult as possible. When measures of real and great importance were under consideration, she would repel the approach of her courtiers, if they sought to make private gain out of public events. But, although what we are about to say seems scarcely consistent with what has been said before, yet it was the case with Elizabeth, as it had been with her father, she found pleasure in giving pleasure to others, and would sometimes gratify her favourites by concessions and grants which her ministers found it difficult to meet. In fact, the besetting sin both of Henry VIII. and of Queen Elizabeth was selfishness. They were willing to do kind acts, but were equally willing to destroy any one, high or low, who offered an impediment to the progress of their selfish desires ; but, in both cases, the sovereign was identified with the people, and England felt that, although Elizabeth, like her father, would sacrifice individuals to her caprice, she also, like her father, was ready to lay down her life for her country.

It is thus that we can account for her treatment of Leicester. She wished to marry ; she pined for the comforts of domestic life. Her heart was given to Robert

CHAP.  
VIII.

Matthew  
Parker.

1559-75.



CHAP.  
VIII.Matthew  
Parker.

1559-75.

Dudley; but, after severe struggles, she sacrificed her private affections for the good of her country. Any one acquainted with the correspondence of Cecil and his contemporaries must arrive at this conclusion; and, instead of ridiculing the weakness of the woman, he will seek to do justice to the conduct of a patriotic queen.

Such was the mistress whom Matthew Parker, a shy, retiring, stammering, studious valetudinarian, was compelled to serve. His character was not yet developed; his many excellences were upon the surface; his weaknesses at this time were known only to himself. In the selection or acceptance of Parker for her primate, Elizabeth exhibited that sagacity by which she read, as it were by intuition, the character of those with whom she was associated. She had known Parker, not intimately, but long; and she saw that, in an age of progress, his principle was *festina lentè*. Amidst enthusiasts he had no enthusiasm; amidst the controversies of the day he distinguished between reform and revolution. He had studied the writings of Zwingle, Luther, and Calvin; and, knowing their faults as well as their merits, he had no inclination to follow their lead. He had studied the fathers and the general councils, and knew the deviations of the Church of Rome from primitive truth. He could distinguish between things essential and things non-essential. Like the queen herself, he had perceived how he might avoid giving offence to the existing government in Queen Mary's reign, without renouncing his character as a reformer. Perhaps no one could be found whose principles more nearly accorded with those of Elizabeth; but she, instead of invariably aiding him in the difficulties he had to surmount, was continually found to thwart him by the concessions she made to unworthy courtiers.

On the 17th of November, 1558, Queen Elizabeth ascended the throne. Historians, writing with a foregone conclusion, are accustomed to represent her government as directing its first attention to ecclesiastical affairs; but, if we have recourse to fact instead of conjecture, this was certainly not the case. It was her opinion, as it was the hope of her wisest advisers, that, unpopular as had been the extreme though opposite measures of the respective governments of Edward VI. and Queen Mary, the Church would at once subside into the condition in which it had been left by Henry VIII.; and that her ministers and clergy would, on that basis, gradually carry on the reformations, the necessity of which they all admitted.

While Elizabeth was yet at Hatfield, and before her first interview with her council for the despatch of business, she had, after a consultation with Cecil, directed him, as her confidential adviser, to draw up a statement of the measures which at once, and without loss of time, ought to occupy the attention of the government. Deplorable, indeed, was the condition of the country. The treasury was exhausted, the revenue anticipated; in addition to which there was a debt, considered, at that time, enormous, of not less than four millions. Not only was trade depressed, but the coin was scandalously debased; there was pestilence, to make more vehement the discontent at home; the feeling of indignation at the loss of Calais was heightened by the fact, that the country was involved in war for the interest of Spain; there was a pretender to the throne, and the legitimacy of its occupant was called in question. In this long list of grievances the religious question was only one item; and in Cecil's scheme of business, so far from making the religious question the primary consideration, he scarcely thought it necessary to notice it.

CHAP.  
VIII.

Matthew  
Parker.  
1559-75.

First  
measures  
of her  
reign.

CHAP.  
VIII.Matthew  
Parker.  
1559-75.

To satisfy the reader upon this point, I will present him with the minute itself.

“I. To consider the proclamation, and to proclaim it, and to send the same to all manner of places and sheriffs with speed, and to print it.

“II. To prepare the Tower, and to appoint the custody thereof to trusty persons, and to write to all the keepers of forts and castles in the queen’s name.

“III. To consider for the removing to the Tower, and the queen there to settle her officers and council.

“IV. To make a stay of passages to all the ports until a certain day; and to consider the situation of all places dangerous towards France and Scotland, especially in this charge.

“V. To send special messengers to the Pope, Emperor, the Kings of Spain and Denmark, and to the State of Venice.

“VI. To send new commissioners to the Earl of Arundel and Bishop of Ely [*who were treating a peace at Cambray*], and to send one into Ireland with a new commission; and letters under the queen’s hand to all ambassadors with foreign princes to authorize them therein.

“VII. To appoint commissioners for the interment of the late queen.

“VIII. To appoint commissioners for the coronation and the day.

“IX. To make a continuance of the term, with patents to the chief justice, to the lord treasurer, justices of each bench, barons, and masters of the rolls, with inhibition, *Quod non conferant aliquod officium*.

“X. To appoint new sheriffs and justices of the peace, to continue the old, by a proclamation to be sent to the sheriffs under the great seal.

“XI. To inhibit by proclamation the making over of any money by exchange, without knowledge given to the queen’s majesty, and to charge all manner of persons that either have made any, or have been privy to any exchange made, by the space of one month before the 17th of this month.

“XII. To consider the preacher of Paul’s Cross, that no



occasion be given by him to stir any dispute touching the governance of the realm.”\*

CHAP.  
VIII.

Matthew  
Parker.

1559-75.

In this memorandum it will be observed, that, instead of defying the pope, communications were to be opened with him ; instead of encouraging Protestants, precautions were taken against the possible exhibition of party feeling at Paul's Cross. The sermon at Paul's Cross very frequently partook of a political character, and had much the same effect upon the public mind as a leading article of "The Times" in the present day. What was heard was repeated, and even when assent was not given to the opinions uttered, those opinions, nevertheless, had a silent influence upon the public mind. It belongs to the general historian to notice the rapidity and decision with which the measures here suggested were carried into effect. It may be doubted whether any page of history can be produced in which an account is given of so much having been done in a single year as was accomplished in the first twelve months of Elizabeth's reign. In one short year the country was raised from "the slough of despond ;" and the first great step was taken in a career of prosperity, which terminated only, if it can be said to have terminated then, with the great queen's life.

Our object in alluding to these political events in this place, is simply to show that, although the government, for reasons presently to be advanced, was at a very early period involved in religious controversy, the establishment of Protestantism, as distinct from the Catholic Church, was not the object of Queen Elizabeth or her advisers, when first she succeeded to the throne of this realm. In the modern sense of the word—although always a reformer—she was not and never became a Protestant.

\* Cottonian MSS. tit. C. x. 21.



CHAP.  
VIII.Matthew  
Parker.

1559-75.

If, at any time, she upheld the Protestant cause, it was upon political grounds, and not from a religious enthusiasm. If we confine the word Protestant to its modern meaning, we have to remark, that not a single Protestant was, on Elizabeth's accession to the crown, added to her council. All the members of the council were Catholics; all insisted on their right to that title. The queen, in the proclamation of her title, declared herself to be not only the defender of the faith, but, as if to exclude all doubt upon the subject, "of the trewe, ancient, and Catholic faith."\*

The Catholic queen retained in her council thirteen statesmen who had occupied the same post in the council of Queen Mary. Elizabeth added to that council seven other persons, not one of whom was, at that time, a Lutheran, a Zwinglian, or a Calvinist. Whatever they may have afterwards become, these eminent men had conformed to the existing services of the Church, when the Book of Common Prayer had been superseded by the Breviary, Missal, and Manual.† If the queen desired to gather round her political advisers, we can scarcely

\* Nares's Burghley, ii. 24.

† See Soames, iv. 604. When a party writer is unable to account for conduct, he is too apt to attribute motives. If he does so, he ought, even when attributing, through lack of charity, a wrong motive, at least to admit the possibility of the existence of a right motive. Soames attributes the occasional conformity of such men as Cecil and Knollys simply to a fear of the stake. We have seen that another motive may be attributed to them: that they did not regard the corruptions of the Church, in which they had been educated, as touching upon fundamentals; so that, without concealing their opinion, that a reformation was required, they were ready to "bide their time." Some of them afterwards may have taken a different view of the case, but such was their opinion at the time under consideration. Mr. Hallam, whose charity seldom slumbers except when religion is concerned, speaks of the majority of Elizabeth's council as consisting of pliant conformists.

imagine a council more judiciously chosen. All English parties were fairly represented; the Protestants being, at this period, regarded in the light of foreigners. If it had been the design of the queen or of Cecil to erect a Protestant sect upon the ruins of the English Church, their conduct would have been as impolitic as it would have been iniquitous. Their object, which was a compromise between the contending extremes, was defeated, almost as soon as it was conceived, by the violence of the Protestants on one side, and a want of wisdom, as well as of charity, on the part of the pope and his partizans. The first measures of the government were, in truth, directed against the Protestants; and the papists were unwise enough to complicate affairs by refusing to assist the government, or to tolerate a compromise.

The exiles had assumed that the accession of Elizabeth was to be the triumph of their party. Although Elizabeth had conformed to the Roman ritual, although she had never regarded herself as a Protestant, she was known to be a reformer. Her chief friends had been selected from the friends of the Reformation: they had been the persons to whom her education had been confided; and by them stories were propagated, showing her hostility to the Romanist party, under which she had been persecuted, her very life having been more than once threatened. The exiles imagined that the papists would rise in favour of Mary Queen of Scots, and that Elizabeth would be dependent entirely upon Protestants for the support of her throne. They calculated, judging from their own feelings, on the reactionary spirit in England. They believed that the Anabaptists and Lollards were more in number than was actually the case; that they only waited for that leadership which they were ready to supply. With the exception of the

CHAP.  
VIII.  
Matthew  
Parker.  
1559-75.

CHAP.  
VIII.  
Matthew  
Parker.  
1559-75.

small party at Frankfort, they were eager to supplant the English Reformation by the introduction of foreign Protestantism, and they had most of the learned writers on their side. Associating with the foreign Protestants, they divided the religious world into two great parties—Protestants and Papists. By Protestantism the majority of the English exiles meant, not Lutheranism, but Calvinism. They regarded the Lutherans as semi-papists, and predicated Lutheranism of the English reformers, such as Parker and Cecil. In a state of enthusiasm, such as party feeling only can excite, they rushed into England intent on the demolition of popery. Uninvited by the government, they appeared unexpectedly in the country, and were inflaming the minds of the people; by too many of whom the idea of reformation was connected with spoliation and rapine.

In an age when the first principles of toleration were unknown, the moderation evinced by Elizabeth's government was as remarkable as it was praiseworthy. The majority, both of the clergy and of the people, until the arrival of the exiles, were evidently prepared to remain at peace so long as they were assured of security to their persons and property; they were ready to submit to reforms rather than to seek them. It was not known how the bench of bishops was likely to act. Many of them had acquiesced in the reforms of Henry VIII.; and it was felt that if, as was probable, they would give their support to the government, the Protestants might be brought to terms. In the mean time it was the policy of the government to protect the peaceable subjects of the queen, and not to exasperate the fanatics on either side.

From the lukewarmness, if not the avowed hostility of the hierarchy, it was gradually perceived that the queen,

however unwilling, might have to place herself at the head of the Protestant interest. Extreme caution was necessary, and there was not likely to be want of caution in a ministry of which Cecil was the head. On the 28th of December a proclamation was issued, which has been so often misrepresented, that I think it right to place it before the reader, in order that he may form his own judgment upon the contents.

CHAP.  
VIII.  
Matthew  
Parker.  
1559-75.

*“The Queen’s proclamation to forbid preaching, and allowing only the reading of the Epistles and Gospels, &c., in English in the churches.*

*“By the Queen.*

“The Queen’s majesty, understanding that there be certain persons, having in times past the office of ministry in the Church, which now do purpose to use their former office in preaching and ministry, and partly have attempted the same; assembling, specially in the city of London, in sundry places, great number of people, whereupon riseth among the common sort, not only unfruitful dispute in matters of religion, but also contention, and occasion to break common quiet, hath therefore, according to the authority committed to her highness, for the quiet governance of all manner her subjects, thought it necessary to charge and command, like as hereby her highness doth charge and command, all manner of her subjects, as well those that be called to ministry in the Church as all others, that they do forbear to preach or teach, or to give audience to any manner of doctrine or preaching, other than to the Gospels and Epistles, commonly called the gospel and the epistle of the day, and to the Ten Commandments, in the vulgar tongue, without exposition or addition of any manner of sense or meaning to be applied or added; or to use any other manner of public prayer, rite, or ceremony in the Church but that which is already used and by law received; or the common Litany used at this present in her majesty’s own chapel, and the Lord’s Prayer, and the Creed in English, until consultation



CHAP.  
VIII.  
Matthew  
Parker.  
1559-75.

may be had by Parliament by her majesty and her three estates of this realm,\* for the better conciliation and accord of such causes as at this present are moved in matters and ceremonies of religion.”†

In this document we see nothing of the Protestant queen, for it is evident, that it was against the returning exiles that the proclamation is chiefly pointed. The tone of the proclamation was preserved in a speech soon after addressed to Parliament in the queen’s name by Sir Nicolas Bacon—what would now be called the Queen’s Speech. Sir Nicolas stated, in the name and by the authority of his royal mistress, that “no party language was to be kept up in this kingdom; that the names of heretic, schismatic, papist, and such like, were to be laid aside and forgotten; that, on the one side, there must be a guard against unlawful worship and superstition, and, on the other, things must not be left under such a loose regulation as to occasion indifferency in religion and contempt of holy things.”‡

In this speech we have an exposition of the principles of the government. What the government desired was, that things might be left *in statu quo* until the proper time arrived for deliberation. The men of the old learning were satisfied by the pledges given, that no alterations in the service of the Church should take place, except those to which they had formerly sent in their adhesion. Mass continued to be celebrated in the churches from November, 1558, to June, 1559. Among the returning exiles there were many who had been ejected from their livings; or whose livings, on their flying from the country, had been declared to be vacant: these persons

\* *I.e.* the lords spiritual, the lords temporal, and the commons in parliament assembled.

† Strype’s *Annals*, I. ii. 391.

‡ D’Ewes’ *Journal*, p. 12.

expected that, in the new reign, they would be re-admitted into their benefices ; but they had been legally dispossessed on account of their flying from their cures, or from want of compliance, on their part, with the statutes of the realm, or with the canons of the Church ; and the queen would not permit the present occupants to be disturbed so long as they consented to conform to the regulations of the Queen, the Convocation, and the Parliament.\*

The queen's conduct was in keeping with her policy. She was as regular as her sister had been in her attendance at mass ; and to the ancient ceremonies she did not hesitate to declare her attachment, even after, as an act of policy, she had given her assent to the Bill of Uniformity.

\* Strype remarks, that the affairs of the Church " continued for a while in the same posture and condition they were in before, abating persecution for religion, mass celebrated in the churches, the ejected and exiled clergy not restored to their former places and preferments, the popish priests keeping possession ; orders that things in the Church should for the present continue as they were ; such punished as innovated in anything in the Church or public worship ; which put the favourers of the gospel," as he calls them, " under great fears and jealousies ; and they began to suspect the queen intended to make none or very little amendment in religion." *Annals*, I. i. 74. The returned exiles were impatient as well as intolerant, and they exhibited a spirit quite as persecuting as that of Mary. " In the time of Mary," says Jewel, who afterwards became a wiser and a better man, " every thing was carried impetuously forward. There was no waiting then for law and precedent. But now every thing is managed with as much slowness and wariness as if the word of God was not to be received on his own authority. As Christ was *thrown out* by his enemies, so He is now *kept out* by his friends. The consequence is, that they who favour us are grievously discouraged, while our adversaries are full of hope and exultation." This letter is given by Burnet, but he does not quote his authority. It is important to observe, that there was as much want of charity on one side as on the other. In another letter Jewel complains, that the returned exiles were not consulted ; and he adds : " The queen will not be entitled the Head of the Church, at which I certainly am not displeased."

CHAP.  
VIII.

Matthew  
Parker.  
1559-75.

CHAP.  
VIII.Matthew  
Parker.

1559-75.

The Protestants, on the other hand, were saved from despair, when they heard, that she prohibited, during the celebration of the mass, the elevation of the host. The host was elevated that it might be worshipped; and against this worship, which they regarded as idolatrous, the English reformers stood as resolutely opposed as the foreign Protestants. This, it will be remembered, was the danger alluded to in the preceding chapter, which the English reformers constantly dreaded. They did not object to attend at the mass, against which, except as related to the elevation of the host, the Protestants had little to urge. But, on the point of transubstantiation, they were determined to make a stand. Elizabeth's conduct therefore, in this respect, was significant. Although she did not declare herself a Protestant, as the exiles understood the word, yet she took her place among the reformers.

The extreme parties were, of course, discontented; and, from their correspondence with the foreign Protestants, we find the returned exiles the most violent, and the most intolerant. They expected the queen to place herself at the head of their faction, and their indignation was equal to their disappointment, when they found her determined to act as the sovereign of the realm, instead of being merely the queen of a party. She took the Church as she found it, and, admitting the necessity of a reformation, she felt her way with caution, and, until she was compelled by circumstances, she desired to persuade all honest parties, by mutual concessions, to co-operate for the well-being of Church and State. The royal chapel—the model of other places of worship—remained the same as it had been in the late queen's reign; the ancient ceremonies were continued; on the decorated altar a crucifix stood, with the approbation of the Lutherans, though denounced by the Calvinists; before the sacrament, tapers were

lighted, while, with the smoke of incense, prayer was offered to the King of kings; to the altar—the *solium Christi*—obeisance was made whenever the chancel was approached. It must, indeed, be admitted, that the chapel royal bore a nearer resemblance to a ritualistic church of the nineteenth century than to a Protestant meeting-house. If it be said that this was unbecoming in a Protestant queen, it is to be observed that this title was not, at this time, assumed by Elizabeth; it was forced upon her by the Puritans, as the exiles were now beginning to be called, when they determined to elect her as their leader.

Determined as she was to have the Protestants in readiness to act as an army of reserve, her first desire was to induce her bishops to resume the position they had occupied in her father's reign. On the 19th of November, when the queen went in state from Hatfield to London, the prelates of the Church of England met her at Highgate, where they were graciously received and kissed hands. We are informed that she received a loyal address from them "with no small contentment." By her desire the obsequies of the late queen were celebrated with great magnificence in Westminster Abbey; and there, as in her own chapel and the other churches in London, the mass was celebrated under the forms observed in King Henry's reign. In the same place, shortly after, were celebrated the obsequies of the Emperor Charles V. She thus proclaimed to Europe, what she had already left it to her own people to infer, that, although she was determined upon a reformation, she intended to preserve the ancient Church of her realm; ready to advance, but to advance with caution.\* In the funeral of Pole, both

CHAP.  
VIII.  
Matthew  
Parker.  
1559-75.

\* Heylin, ii. 266, ed. Rob. By this writer it is said, that Elizabeth refused to permit her hand to be kissed by the Bishop of London, the notorious Bonner; but, if such was the case, Bonner did not take



CHAP.  
VIII.Matthew  
Parker.

1559-75.

the queen and Cecil took such a deep interest as to confirm the general opinion that, to his kind offices, both of them had been under obligations. When the Convocation assembled on the 27th of January, 1559, it was opened with the high mass. It was not concealed that negotiations had commenced at Rome; and it was evident to all, that no decided steps would be taken in the affairs of religion until the policy of Rome, as it regarded the accession of the queen, should be made known.

Conduct of  
the Pope.

Such was the policy of the queen and Cecil. On a reform they were determined; to Calvinism they were opposed. The character of the reformation would depend upon the proceedings of the pope, whether conciliatory or otherwise. There was no wish to form an alliance with the Protestants; but Elizabeth soon showed that she was not to be trifled with; and when she was obliged to make a stand, she made it sufficiently clear that her disposition to effect a reconciliation between discordant parties did not proceed on her part from want of vigour of mind or strength of will. Whether she would come to terms with the pope, it was for his holiness to decide. But instead of meeting her half way, the impassioned old man lent an ear to the hostile representations of the French ambassador; and the French ambassador had already acquired an influence over a mind often distorted by passion and prejudice, and now deprived of its pristine vigour

offence; for, although he was not permitted to officiate at the queen's coronation, he lent his vestments to one of his brethren. "Let me add one particular more, as preparatory to the queen's coronation. The lords sent to Bonner, Bishop of London, to lend to the Bishop of Carlisle, who was appointed (as they writ) to execute the solemnity of the queen's majesty's coronation, *universum apparatus pontificium quo uti solent episcopi in hujusmodi magnificis illustrissimorum regum inaugurationibus*, i. e. all the pontifical habits that bishops were wont to use in such glorious inaugurations of most illustrious kings."

by the increasing imbecility of old age. Sir Edward Carne, the English ambassador at Rome, was instructed to wait upon the pontiff, and in due form to acquaint him of the accession of his royal mistress to the English throne. He was also directed to express the young queen's determination not to offer violence to the consciences of her subjects; an assertion tantamount to a proposal to confer with his holiness on the condition of the Church of England. To conciliate the pope was a matter of considerable importance to the queen. Being aware that the Protestants could not do without her, she paid but little attention to their interests. The one point she wished now to establish was the recognition of her right to the throne. Foreign powers were hesitating, doubtful as to the course which their several interests might induce them to adopt. One word from the pope would have disarmed the enemies of Elizabeth, and would have strengthened the hands of her friends.

To the overtures of Elizabeth, however, an answer was returned, insolent in tone, and offensively coarse in language. Paul IV. dared to affirm, that "the kingdom of England was held in fee of the apostolic see; that Elizabeth, being illegitimate, could not succeed to the throne; that assuming the government without his sanction was on her part an impertinence; and yet," he added, "being desirous to show a fatherly affection, if she would renounce her pretensions, and refer herself wholly to his free disposition, he would do whatever might be done without damage to the holy see."\*

By this insolent and impolitic answer it became apparent to Elizabeth and Cecil, that, while still intending to pursue a conciliatory policy, they must in future rely

\* Sarpi, p. 111. Pallavicino, ii. 532. Heylin, ii. 268. Strype, Annals, i. i. 36.

CHAP.  
VIII.

Matthew  
Parker.

1559-75.

upon the Protestants. The exiles were now permitted to return to their homes, and were at this time invariably treated with the respect due to their learning, their piety, and their past sufferings, precautions being at the same time taken to maintain the principles of the Church ; and by concessions, which were often too liberally made, to win them over to support the English against the foreign Reformation.

But a greater attention to the conciliation of Protestants did not prevent the government from pursuing the course they had already adopted, of meeting the wishes of those among the queen's subjects whose inclinations were known to attract them to Rome, provided they were willing to submit to the royal supremacy, and to obey all legal enactments. Here again the policy of the government was thwarted, not so much by the hostility, as by the weakness of the existing hierarchy. The bishops, unaware of the master-mind of their youthful sovereign, imagined that by declining to support her government, they might bend her to their will. We know, that to the Reformation itself they were not disinclined; but disgrace had been brought upon the episcopate by their submission to the various changes in regard to religion, which had taken place in the preceding reigns; they felt, that they ought to make a stop somewhere, and they could not do so better than when an inexperienced young woman, with a questionable title, had ascended the throne. They evidently wished, while maintaining their position, to offer as little trouble as possible to the queen and her council; but, on the other hand, they were urged by their friends on the Continent to act with determination and vigour. They miscalculated both their own strength and the weakness of the queen. They soon found that there existed in her that clear perception

of her aim and that firmness of purpose in which they themselves were lacking. Beyond their opposition there was little to complain of in their conduct, and this accounts for the kind treatment accorded to them when they resigned their sees. An indiscreet sermon by the Bishop of Winchester, Dr. White, at the funeral of Queen Mary, gave just cause of offence to the Protestants, whom he outraged; but it does not appear that he was regarded, either by the bishops themselves or by the government, as speaking the sentiments of the hierarchy. It was the outburst of an intolerant temper, which was visited by an order of council that he should confine himself to his house for a week, a precautionary measure, both to pacify the Protestants and to prevent a disturbance.

It was the policy of the government to remain on good terms with the bishops, because, from the circumstances under which Queen Elizabeth ascended the throne of her ancestors, the coronation was, in her case, a ceremonial of more than ordinary importance. It was important that ancient precedent should be followed as nearly as possible, and, as the essential point in the service was not the mere placing of the crown upon the sovereign's head, but the unction of the royal person, whereby she was invested with a quasi-sacred character, it was also important that this function should be discharged by a bishop. There were indeed several bishops in England, but they had been ousted from their dioceses; and the attendance of at least three of the diocesans was greatly to be desired. As in modern times a coronation is regarded as a mere court pageant, the following remarks of a learned writer are worthy of being quoted for the information of the reader: "The anointing was always held to confer sacredness upon the person of the sovereign, and for this we have the authority of St. Augustine, who speaks,

CHAP.  
VIII.

Matthew  
Parker.  
1559-75.

Prepara-  
tions for  
the Coro-  
nation.



CHAP.  
VIII.Matthew  
Parker.

1559-75.

indeed, of the earlier unction of the Jewish kings ; but the argument is the same. ‘Quæro, si non habebat Saul sacramenti sanctitatem, quid in eo David venerabatur ? Si autem habebat innocentiam, quare innocentem persequeretur ? nam cum propter sacrosanctam unctionem, et honoravit vivum, et vindicavit occisum : et quia vel panniculum ex ejus veste præscidit, percusso corde trepidavit. Ecce Saul non habebat innocentiam, et tamen habebat sanctitatem, non vitæ suæ (nam hoc sine innocentia nemo potest) sed sacramenti Dei, quod et in malis hominibus sanctum est.’ The reader will observe that St. Augustine calls the regal unction, in the above passage, a sacrament ; nor, relying upon his authority, does there appear to be any objection to the use of so high a term, in the same wide sense in which we speak of the sacrament of orders, or of marriage. So, also, St. Gregory the Great says expressly, ‘Quia vero ipsa unctio sacramentum est, is qui promovetur, bene foris ungitur, si intus virtute sacramenti roboretur.’ ‘Rex unctus,’ says Lyndwood, ‘non mere persona laica sed mixta secundum quosdam.’ But this anointing must not be looked upon, neither ever has it been, as conferring any sacerdotal right or privilege : the sovereigns of England are supreme in all cases whether ecclesiastical or civil, as in the one, so in the other, both before and after the solemnity of the coronation ; nor are their prerogatives increased by its performance, or hindered by its delay : and, as before they have no power, so neither after the regal unction have they any right or authority to minister the sacraments, or the Word of God.” \*

\* Maskell, iii. xiv. ; see also Freeman’s Norman Conquest, iii. 622. This remarkable work is as valuable to the archæologist as to the historian. One of the ecclesiastical laws of St. Edward the Confessor is entitled “*Quid sit regis officium*,” and begins, “Rex autem, qui vicarius summi

We come now to an extraordinary page of history. It is the custom for almost every writer to state, that only one bishop officiated at the coronation of Queen Elizabeth ; but these very writers, when describing the coronation, are obliged to admit the presence of others.\* The queen, Cecil, and her present advisers, generally, were accustomed to attend the mass, though the queen would not permit the elevation of the host, for the reasons already given. It was probably on this account that Archbishop Heath, on whom devolved the right of crowning the queen, the see of Canterbury being vacant, declined to officiate on the occasion. But the elevation of the host was not necessary to satisfy those who assisted at the mass, *i. e.* who attended the celebration without partaking of the sacrament. The

CHAP.  
VIII.Matthew  
Parker.

1559-75.

regis est, ad hoc est constitutus, ut regnum terrenum et populum Domini et super omnia sanctam veneretur ecclesiam ejus, et regat." Wilkins's Concilia, i. 312. And compare the second of the Anglo-Saxon Institutes of an Earthly King. Thorpe, Ancient Laws and Institutes, ii. 305. Maskell, vol. iii. p. xiv. xvi.

\* Dr. Nares, for example, in his *Life of Burghley*, asserts that the bishops refused to assist at the coronation ; and, drawing upon his imagination, he gives the reasons for their absence ; and yet he says of Burghley, that he "appears to have been placed particularly nigh to the queen's person ; since, in the account to be seen in the Ashmolean Museum, when the queen approached the altar, where cushions of gold were placed for her use, we read that Secretary Cecil delivered a book to the bishop, and there was a bishop standing at the left hand of the altar." Nares, ii. 24. Camden seems to be the authority on whom the historians alluded to have relied ; but Soames reminds us that, when Elizabeth was crowned, the great antiquary was a child ; and, although he asserts that the Bishop of Carlisle officiated, he does not say that the others were absent. Soames truly remarks, that all the bishops were present, although so great had been the mortality on the episcopal bench, that the number was small. I may here add, that Bishop Oglethorpe was by no means a narrow-minded man ; he admitted even that "the form and order of religion now set forth," in the reign of Edward VI., was nearer the practice of the primitive and apostolical Church than that which was formerly in England.

CHAP.  
VIII.Matthew  
Parker.

1559-75.

difficulty was at length overcome, Bishop Oglethorpe having expressed his readiness to meet the wishes of the queen. If the queen conceded everything to the diocesan, except one ceremony, it was not much for the diocesan, at a time when they still entertained the hope of bending Elizabeth to their will, to yield to what they regarded as a prejudice on her part which might hereafter be overcome. So many concessions had already been made that more might be fairly expected.

The coronation was in fact performed with the usual ceremonies and with the mass; not according to the Romish form, as some unfriendly historians are pleased to assert, but according to the old Church of England formula, which, admitting adaptations to the exigencies of each reign, had existed from the earliest periods of our history, and which is substantially the form still in use.\*

\* The late Sir Francis Palgrave informed me, that it is the form that was always adopted at the coronation of the emperor. The learned writer whom I have already quoted remarks: "It would not be right to speak of the coronation service, which I have edited in this volume, as of the use of Sarum, although taken from the pontifical of that church; nor, in like manner, of the same service as according to the use of Winchester or Exeter. Those churches, at the periods when the particular copies of their pontificals were written, now at one time, now at another, adopted and included, according to its then state, this office, which formed one of the chief duties of the bishops of the Church. The coronation service was always 'according to the use of the Church of England;' or, on account of its high privilege as the place where the solemnity was to be performed, 'according to the use of the church of Westminster;' so also, in modern times, the coronation service must be regarded as 'according to the use of the Church of England.' The earliest state in which we find the order as it was in the pontifical of Egbert, Archbishop of York, in the eighth century, is not different indeed from that which was last used upon the coronation of her present majesty. The alterations, whether of omission or addition, have been made gradually; and it is probably true that there has never yet been a coronation without the service being subjected to some change, either for the better or for the worse. The records of Ethelred, Henry I.,



The diocesan bishops attended with the exception of Bonner, who, nevertheless, as has been before stated, lent his scarlet robes to one of the prelates, who would not otherwise have been properly equipped for the occasion. The prelate who officiated was the Bishop of Carlisle, Dr. Owen Oglethorpe. On the 15th of January the coronation took place in Westminster Abbey. The queen went first to Westminster Hall, and, says Strype, "there went before her trumpets, knights, and lords, heralds of arms in their rich coats; then the nobles in their scarlet, *and all the bishops in scarlet*; then the queen, and all the footmen, waiting upon her to the Hall. There her grace's apparel was changed. In the Hall they met the bishop who was to perform the ceremony, and all the chapel, with three crosses borne before them, in their copes, the bishop mitred, and singing as they passed, *Salve festa dies*—all the streets, new laid with gravel and blue cloth, and railed in on each side, and so to the Abbey to mass, and there her grace was crowned. Thence, the ceremony ended, the queen and her retinue went to Westminster Hall to dinner; and every officer took his office at service upon their lands, and so did the Lord Mayor of London and the Aldermen." \*

CHAP.  
VIII.  
Matthew  
Parker.  
1559-75.

Corona-  
tion of  
Elizabeth.  
Jan. 15.

From a desire to explain the position assumed by the several parties with which the government had to contend, I have been induced partially to anticipate the history of

Edward II., and Richard II. prove this, no less than those of James I., or George I., or Queen Victoria."

\* Strype's Annals, I. i. 44. The writer of these pages was present at the coronation of George IV.: seeing him first in the Hall, he followed him to the Abbey, and then returned to the Hall, where was "high feasting;" and, except that the mass was turned into the communion, he might have described what he witnessed very nearly in the words given in the text.



CHAP.  
VIII.Matthew  
Parker.

1559-75.

Parker. Antecedently to the coronation he had arrived in London; and to his conciliatory manners and clear insight into the real position of affairs, we may attribute the satisfactory termination of the negotiations relating to the coronation. No party could now gainsay the fact, that Elizabeth of England was an anointed sovereign.

Although considerably senior to Cecil and Bacon, Parker had been their friend and adviser during their career at Cambridge, and an intimacy ensued. When the conciliatory policy of the government was determined upon, Cecil advised the queen to call Dr. Parker to her counsels. He might fairly be considered as the leader and representative of the English Reformers. Like the queen and Cecil, his desire was to conciliate the Romanizers, and thence to proceed in a course of gradual reform. Repelled by the Romanizing party, they soon found that it would be necessary to conciliate the Protestants, and to save from their extravagance as much as they could of Catholic truth.

Parker  
summoned  
to London.

Almost immediately after the nomination of Bacon as Keeper of the Great Seal, and before he was sworn into office, Parker received from him a kind and friendly letter. Parker was invited to London in the first instance, to confer with his friends upon his private affairs. Bacon offered to receive him as a visitor at Burgany House, his town residence.\*

If Parker could not make it convenient to undertake a journey to the metropolis before Bacon left town, Cecil, now become Bacon's brother-in-law, offered to receive him as a guest. Parker was obliged to decline the invitation, as he was at that time suffering from the

\* Burgany, or Burgavenny, House had been the residence of the Earls of Abergavenny, at the north end of "Ave Mary Lane." Stow's Survey, p. 127. It was probably hired by Sir Nicolas Bacon, who afterwards purchased and rebuilt Shelley House in Noble Street, Aldersgate, thenceforth called Bacon House.

CHAP.  
VIII.Matthew  
Parker.  
1559-75.

ague. He states that he had signified through his friend, Sir John Cheke, who had made known to him Cecil's desire to serve him, that he desired no high preferment. "I would be inwardly heavy and sorry," he writes, "that Sir William Cecil's favourable affection should procure me anything above the reach of mine ability, whereby I should both dishonest myself, and disappoint the expectation of such as may think that in me which I know is not; but specially I might clog and cumber my conscience to God-ward, before whom I look every day to appear to make mine answer, which I think, and, as I trust, is not far off. Notwithstanding, though I would most fain wear out the rest of my life in private state, yet concerning that very small talent credited unto me, I would not so unthankfully to God ensue my quiet, that I could not be content to bestow it, so it were there whither my heart and conscience afore this time, and daily yet doth incline me."\* He goes on to state, that he wishes for nothing more than the revenue of some prebend, so that he might occupy himself in preaching the gospel in poor and destitute parishes; for this, he thought, was better suited for his decayed voice and small quality, than in theatrical and great audience. Of all places in England he would prefer to live in the University of Cambridge, where much reformation was wanted. "To tell you my heart," he continues, "I had rather have such a thing as Bene't College is in Cambridge, a living of twenty nobles by the year at the most, than to dwell in the deanery of Lincoln, which is two hundred at the least." He especially deprecated any public appointment. There is a reference in the letter to certain exhibitions at Cambridge, main-

\* See Parker's Corresp. p. 50. The letter is without date, but the editors of the volume place it between the 9th and the 20th of December, 1558.

CHAP.  
VIII.Matthew  
Parker.

1559-75.

tained by the generosity of Bacon, which leads us to suppose that Parker had already returned to the University he so dearly loved. He was certainly there in March, when he was actively employed in procuring Cecil's election to the office of chancellor.

Having neglected the invitations he received from Bacon and Cecil, under the impression that they wished to force some public employment upon him, he received a short and peremptory note from Cecil, conveying a royal command that he should, "upon the sight hereof, put himself in order to make his indelayed repair unto London, when he would declare her majesty's further pleasure."

It appears that, probably on the ground of his ill health, he neglected to obey the summons; for, on the 4th of January, he received another letter from Bacon, who supposes that Cecil's letter had miscarried, and warning him that he must immediately commence his journey to London if his health permitted.\* As we have no letters from Parker in his Correspondence between the 4th of January and the 1st of March, we may presume that he acted in obedience to the royal command, and repaired to London. He was certainly soon after in frequent conference with the ministers, and became a leading personage in those councils of state which Cecil now in the queen's name convened. The state of his health, however, continued so infirm, that he was under the necessity of occasionally seeking, for two or three days, a little country air. We have already stated the condition of public affairs; and it became every day more apparent, that, contrary to the wishes of Cecil and Parker, they would have to make terms, not with the Romanizing party, but with the exiles. Although the persons forming the party are described by the learned editor of Fuller,

\* Corresp. p. 53.

as "new men of the very lowest principles, and most doubtful orthodoxy," yet there were many exceptions, and among the exiles a party had arisen which, through evil report and good report, had adhered to the principles of the English Reformation. For an account of the fierce controversies which prevailed among the English, who fled from the persecutions of Mary, the reader must be referred to the general historian. Nevertheless, it is necessary briefly to touch upon the subject.

When the English refugees applied for protection to the Protestants strictly so called, that is, to the Lutherans, they were treated as worse than Papists, and the Papists, bad as they were, had certainly no monopoly of persecution. In vain did the English refer to their sufferings; it was retorted that, even by heretics, persecution could be endured. In vain, so far as the continental Protestants were concerned, did they discard the dogma of transubstantiation if consubstantiation was rejected. In vain did they reject the supremacy of the Bishop of Rome, unless they allowed Martin Luther to usurp his place. These were severe measures; and the more severe because it was of Lutheranizing that the English reformers were accused at home. But the Germans declared the English martyrs under Mary to be the devil's martyrs, not the martyrs of God. In vain did the gentle Melancthon plead in their behalf. They were told that the Protestant or Lutheran religion and the religion of the Church of England were two distinct and different things; a fact, the forgetfulness of which has, for three centuries, involved us in difficulties and endless controversy.\*

CHAP.  
VIII.

Matthew  
Parker.

1559-75.

\* *Vociferantur quidam Martyres Anglicos esse Martyres Diaboli.* See Melancthon, ep. i. 2. Melancthon makes an exception in favour of Latimer and a few others whom he had known. On the Continent, the Lutherans for a long time assumed exclusively the title of Protestants. The Calvinists, when not called by the name of their founder, took the title



CHAP.  
VIII.Matthew  
Parker.

1559-75.

Under these circumstances, the refugees were thrown into the arms of the Calvinists, and soon became more or less under the influence of the illustrious founder of that sect. Even of those who, with justifiable national prejudice, upheld in foreign parts the cause of the formularies of the Church of England, too many returned with a desire to approach Calvinism as nearly as they consistently could. These had, many of them, made a manful stand in favour of the Prayer Book at Frankfort. It was through them that the Anglo-Catholic party, under Parker and Cecil, opened communications with the returned exiles; but, for reasons just assigned, they did not receive that cordiality of support which they had a right to expect. Even these mediating parties were in frequent correspondence with the leading Calvinists abroad; and some of them received the dishonest advice, that they should conform to the Church, in order that they might obtain the power and the means of subverting those principles which the English reformers desired to maintain; and, for the maintenance of which, whatever their previous vacillations may have been, Ridley, Latimer, and even Cranmer, declared that they laid down their lives.\*

Liturgical  
Reform.

When Parker came to town, he found that the queen and Cecil had determined to retain the first book of Edward VI. as the Book of Common Prayer for the English Church. Although published in the reign of Edward VI.,

of "the reformed." From the want of a strict nomenclature on this point endless confusion has been introduced into the ecclesiastical history of England. It is easier to adopt terms than to change them. I shall in this biography apply the term Protestant to the Anglo-Catholics, that of Puritan to the Calvinists, and that of Papist to the emissaries of Rome.

\* Even Peter Martyr, in his letters to Jewel, recommended that scrupulous divines should wear the vestments, and yet never cease to preach against them.

it had been prepared in the reign of Henry VIII. It might admit of some alterations, but those alterations would have been made with a view of reclaiming some Catholic observances which had been overlooked; but Parker was soon convinced that he must so far yield to the exiles, as to permit them to make the second book of Edward the basis of his liturgical reforms. If Parker was disappointed with respect to those, among the returned exiles, who still professed to uphold the principles of the English Reformers, he was equally disappointed by finding the Romanizing party mustering its forces to reject every attempt at reformation. The tangible difficulty at this time was the hostile front presented by the Convocation. The attention of the government had been exclusively directed to the parliamentary elections. When we say that they sought to pack the House of Commons, we do not intend to convey a censure so severe as that, to which such a course would in these days be obnoxious. As in the election of a bishop, freedom of choice is legally conceded to the electors, while the *cong   d'  lire* is accompanied by a letter missive, naming the person in favour of whom the choice is to be exercised, so was it customary in those days, for the court, at a general election of members of parliament, to nominate five candidates for each shire, and three for each borough, out of whom the election was to be made. In either case it was an act of despotism; but, until the passions of the multitude are inflamed by demagogues, it is astonishing to see how passively to customary acts of despotism the multitude will yield. The feeling was that, in electing a parliament, they were electing a great council to advise the crown, and the object was to select everywhere the wisest men. This system answered well, until it was discovered that Parliament might be the means of gratifying

CHAP.  
VIII.

Matthew  
Parker.

1559-75.

CHAP.  
VIII.Matthew  
Parker.  
1559-75.

private ambition ; and that those who denounced a poor elector for taking bribes, might promote the interests of himself and family by devoting himself to the service of a party which, if bitter against opponents, has always known how to reward its supporters.

What had been done with respect to Parliament, might have been done with respect to Convocation. But it will be remembered that the religious question was not the first which occupied the minds of Elizabeth's councillors. They thought, moreover, that the majority of the clergy, caring little for doctrinal questions, would sanction any reforms which did not interfere with the rights of property. In the absence of government interference, the archdeacons and officials of the ecclesiastical courts, whose interest it was to retard the Reformation, bestirred themselves. Parker soon perceived that little could be done with the then existing convocation, and that, before the dissolution of Parliament, a new convocation could not be called. It was a sad oversight, and rendered necessary a recourse to an appeal to the prerogative, as well as to measures such as Parker would not otherwise have recommended.

Two parties, it was represented to the queen, stood prepared, neither to be conciliated, and both to intimidate the youthful sovereign. Little did those parties know the master mind and the stern will to which they stood opposed. Elizabeth was determined, by the aid of Parliament and the exertion of her prerogative, which was at that time very high, to bring the one party down and to raise the other party up to her own level.

Appoint-  
ment of  
commis-  
sion for  
ecclesiasti-  
cal reform.

She directed Cecil to appoint a committee to prepare measures, to be submitted to the Parliament about to be assembled. This committee was to consist of persons who represented the English reformation and the

opinions of the queen herself; that is to say, of men determined to preserve the old Catholic Church of England; not to deviate from its hereditary customs in ceremony or in vestments, except when such deviations were necessary to support the primitive truth against medieval error; to venerate antiquity, while avoiding superstition; to secure the apostolical succession; and to insist on nothing *de fide* except what could be proved from Scripture as interpreted by patristic tradition. Here was a platform on which latitude was allowed to all parties whose desire it was, notwithstanding minor differences of opinion, to unite and co-operate.

The leading advocates of these principles, in addition to Cecil and the queen, were Dr. Parker, late Dean of Lincoln; Dr. Bill, late Master of Trinity College, Cambridge, and almoner to the queen; Dr. May, late Dean of St. Paul's; and Bernard Gilpin, the Apostle of the North. The government nominated the chairman, Sir Thomas Smith, though the duties which devolved upon him corresponded with those which are generally, in the present day, assigned to the secretary of a royal commission. He was to prepare the business, to arrange the details, to report proceedings, to secure requisite information on all topics suggested for discussion. The commission met at his house in Canon Lane, where every necessary of life was provided for the members of the commission. In his office of chairman or secretary, Sir Thomas Smith added weight to the authority of the commissioners already named; for he was regarded as the queen's representative. To invite the bishops to become members of the commission was evidently useless, because, though they showed no violent opposition to the government, they evidently expected, by withholding their support,

CHAP.  
VIII.

Matthew  
Parker.

1559-75.



CHAP.  
VIII.Matthew  
Parker.

1559-75.

to compel the queen to defer to their opinions and accede to their terms. They thought to rule her majesty, and her majesty intended to be ruled by neither the one party nor the other. Equally useless it was to call in the aid of the ultra-Protestants, for they ignored all that had hitherto been done, and desired that the Reformation should begin *de novo*, on principles in direct opposition to those of the queen and of the English reformers. They were most of them devoted to Calvin, by whom the English Church and its reformation had already been coarsely denounced; and of Calvin, the queen had a just and increasing abhorrence. But the Puritans could not be entirely passed over, for among them were some of the most devout and learned men of the age; and others there were, who, though under the influence of foreign Protestants, were open to conviction. The persons last mentioned gave in their adhesion to the second Prayer Book of Edward VI., although it unequivocally asserted the doctrine of baptismal regeneration; and, as the English reformers were accustomed to maintain, the Real, as distinguishable from the Corporeal, Presence of our Lord in the Sacrament of his Body and Blood. Among these we may mention Whitehead, Grindal, and Pilkington, who, for the most part orthodox themselves, were frequently led into inconsistencies from their desire to obtain concessions for the extreme Puritans; they sometimes succeeded to the detriment of the Church. Their acceptance, however, of a place in the commission, so far strengthened the hands of the government, that it showed the bishops, who headed the opposition, that if they continued to withhold their support, the government had the means to defy them; and the Puritans, if not satisfied, were at least for the time pacified.

The commission met.\* Parker and Cecil, supported by the queen, determined to concede as little as was possible, and to retain of the ancient ritual as much as they were able. The discussions were amicable, and Parker was the personal friend of every member of the board. Unfortunately, however, for the Church, Parker's ill health continued, and from the meetings of the commission he was frequently obliged to absent himself. When he found this to be the case, he permitted Dr. Gheast† to be added to the commission.

CHAP.  
VIII.

Matthew  
Parker.  
1559-75.

Edmund Gheast had not been one of the exiles, and he upheld the English reformation. He was regarded as representing Parker's opinions; but he was frequently open to the charge of vacillation. Such was his dread of giving offence, that he was found sometimes to yield to the Puritans, and even to adopt their sentiments, when, if Parker had been present, their proposals would have been resisted.

Everything in which Cecil was concerned was conducted methodically, and a plan of the proceedings had been prepared by him, after consultation with Parker, which was called a Device. It is a document of considerable length, in which the necessity of making some alterations in Church affairs is asserted, the dangers attending such alterations being admitted, and the best mode of meeting the difficulty being suggested. Imme-

Cecil's  
Device.

\* See Strype's Life of Smith, p. 56. Nares's Burghley, ii. 41, 42. Strype's Annals, I. i. 1. Heylin, ii. 273.

† See Life of Bishop Geste by Henry Geast Dugdale. The name is differently spelt. Stubbs gives the name Gheast, taking it from the registers. I give it as I find it in the Registrum of Professor Stubbs, in accordance with a rule formerly laid down. Stubbs may not always be right; but it is very difficult to prove him to be wrong.

CHAP.  
VIII.

Matthew  
Parker.

1559-75.

diate action was declared to be necessary, in order that the policy of the pope might be anticipated and frustrated; for it was expected that the Bishop of Rome, as he was designated, might excommunicate Elizabeth, and, on her excommunication, invite the continental powers in league with Rome for the invasion of England. Among men of the "Papist sect," the pope might find supporters in England, if precautions were not taken in good time to coerce or restrain them. It was remarked, however, that it was not from this quarter only that danger was to be apprehended; there were others who would abet "an alteration from the Church of Rome—who would, when they saw many of the old ceremonies retained, and those doctrines—the doctrines of the foreign reformation, which they had embraced—not only not allowed, but abolished and disproved, would be discontented, and would call the alteration *a cloked papistry, or a mingle-mangle.*" It is important to observe, that the English reformers foresaw their difficulties on either side, and knew what they were about. In the solution of the difficulty last named, the whole policy of Parker and Cecil is foreshadowed. "It is," says the Device, "better that they—the ultra-Protestants or Puritans—should suffer, than that her highness, or the commonwealth, should shake or be in danger."

The *via media* is clearly laid down.

Bill of  
Uniformity.

In preparing a Bill for the ensuing Parliament, the real position of the queen was a point first to be decided. The title of Head of the Church, which Henry VIII. had assumed, gave as much offence to the Papists and the Puritans as to the English reformers. By ignorance or malignity it is still applied by Erastians to the reigning sovereign; but the title was repudiated by the wisdom

or the piety of Queen Elizabeth.\* But, in rejecting this profane title, Elizabeth had no intention to resign those powers with which, even in spiritual affairs, the constitution in Church and State had invested the sovereign. It was declared, "that we give not to our princes the ministry, either of God's word or sacraments . . . but only the prerogative, which seems to have been given always to godly princes in Holy Scripture by God himself; that is, that they should rule all states and degrees committed to their charge by God, whether they be ecclesiastical or temporal, and restrain with the civil sword the stubborn and evildoer." †

CHAP.  
VIII.

Matthew  
Parker.

1559-75.

Royal su-  
premacy.

\* In a letter from Dr. Sandys to Parker, he says, "Mr. Lever wisely put such a scruple in the queen's head, that she would not take the title of supreme head." Corresp. p. 66. Jewel, in writing to Peter Martyr, says, "The queen declines being styled Head of the Church, at which I am certainly not much displeased." Zurich Letters, p. 24. Again, in writing to Bullinger, Jewel informs his correspondent, "The queen is unwilling to be addressed, either by word of mouth or in writing, as the Head of the Church of England. For she seriously maintains that this honour is due to Christ alone, and cannot belong to any human being soever." Zurich Letters, p. 33.

† This subject has been fully discussed in the introductory chapter to this book, where Mr. Gladstone's argument against those who apply the title of Head of the Church to the sovereign, is cited at length. I add here a quotation from the Regulations of the Discipline and Order of the Church, published by Queen Elizabeth immediately after the passing of the Act of Uniformity. Having noticed the misconstructions of her claims to the temporal supremacy, she then proceeds to say, "Her majesty neither doth, nor ever will, challenge any other authority than what was challenged and lately used by the noble kings of famous memory, Henry VIII. and Edward VI., which is *and was of ancient time* due to the imperial crown of the realm; that is, under God, to have sovereignty and rule over all manner of persons, born within these her realms and dominions, so as no power shall or ought to have any superiority over them." In the next Parliament this explanation of the oath of supremacy received the sanction of the legislature. It is generally called "Queen Elizabeth's admonition." An Act, which



CHAP.  
VIII.Matthew  
Parker.  
1559-75.Prayer  
Book.

The first point to which the commission had now to direct attention was to the Bill of Uniformity about to be submitted to the Parliament. Several difficulties here presented themselves to the mind of Parker. To Jewel, Sandys, Horn, Cox, Grindal, and others, to whom Parker looked for at least a qualified support; to the Earl of Bedford, and to the queen herself, violent and intolerant letters were written by Bullinger, Peter Martyr, and Weidner, denunciatory of the English reformation, and calling upon them to resist, with all their might, those men—the English reformers—by whose means the seeds of popery were still retained among us. The principles of several among the ecclesiastics were thus shaken at a time when firmness was most required. The foreigners had the sagacity to see, that many who held doctrinally the Puritan principles were anxious to share in the emoluments of the Church; their great fear was, lest to carry this object they should be induced to concede too much. While the queen and her council desired to conciliate the few Papists still retaining an influence in the country, the object of the ultra-Protestants was to exasperate them, and to form two parties which, as has unfortunately been the case, would be in a perpetual state of antagonism, the one against the other.

Liturgical  
reforms.

Parker, from his antiquarian researches, was well cal-

was passed in the fifth year of her majesty, directed that the oath should be taken and expounded in this sense. The object of the acts passed in Queen Elizabeth's reign, bearing upon the royal authority, is declared by Sir Edward Coke to have been merely to restore to the crown the rights *it had always possessed by the common law of the realm*. See Comyn's Digest, art. "Prerogative." To the same effect see Judge Blackstone, Comment. iv. 33. Bracton indeed, who was made a judge by Henry III. in the thirteenth century, when popery was rampant, expresses himself thus: *Rex est vicarius et minister Dei, tam in spiritualibus quam in temporalibus*. Lib. i. cap. 8.

culated to take the lead in what related to liturgical reform. The history of our liturgical offices—applying the term liturgy, not in its strict sense, to the Communion office, but in that larger sense in which the term is applicable to all that is contained in the Book of Common Prayer—is one of peculiar interest. The very foundation of our Church was laid in a liturgical discussion, settled by the largeness of mind exhibited by Gregory the Great, rather than by any general controversy bearing upon theory instead of practice. The reader of these volumes is aware, that our Prayer Book is to be traced for its origin, not to Rome, but through the Gallican Church to the Churches of Ephesus and Smyrna. When, under Augustine, the missionary prelate, and Ethelbert the king, the foundations of the Church of England were laid, Augustine was astonished to find that the sacred offices were not administered in the Church of Gaul—by the bishops of which Church he was consecrated—under those forms to which he had been habituated when he ministered as a priest in Rome. The advice given to him by Gregory, when Augustine was perplexed how to act, was based on that principle on which our Reformers professed to proceed, as may be seen from the Preface to the Book of Common Prayer. “You, my brother,” wrote Gregory to the first Archbishop of Canterbury, “are acquainted with the customs of the Roman Church in which you were educated; but I advise you, if you have found anything either in the Roman, or in the Gallican, or in any other Church which may be acceptable to Almighty God, that you carefully make choice of the same, and sedulously teach the Church of the Angles, who are at present new in the faith, whatsoever you gather from the principal Churches. For things are not to be loved for the sake of places, but places for the sake of good

CHAP.  
VIII.

Matthew  
Parker.

1559-75.

CHAP.  
VIII.Matthew  
Parker.

1559-75.

things. Select, therefore, those things which are pious, religious, and orderly ; and when you have made these up into one book, instil this into the minds of the English for their use.” \*

It does not appear that Augustine collected the offices of the Church into one book ; and we find it as a matter of fact, after the age of Theodorus, that the Breviary, † the Missal, and the Manual were generally kept in separate volumes. Before the application of the printing-press to the purposes of literature, errors were certain to be introduced by the carelessness of transcribers, or with the object of meeting the *crotchets* of various divines, who then, as now, would make the Church, if possible, condescend to their own extravagant fancies, instead of forcing their private opinions to bend to the rule of the Church.

\* Gregory, Opera, ii. 1151. Bæda, i. xxvii. The Roman Breviary was not used in France until after the Revolution ; nor was it introduced into England until about a century and a half ago, when some of the Romish priests, being Jesuits, were obliged, in accordance with the principles of their sect, to use it. The Romish sect established in England by Cardinal Wiseman has, I am informed, adopted all Roman forms. For an account of our Prayer Book, see Sir William Palmer, Archdeacon Freeman, Lathbury, Sparrow, Hardwick, Maskell, Buller, Proctor, and Cardwell, compared with Bingham, Collier, Cosin, Heylin, L'Estrange, and Neal. These writers would be the first to express their obligations to such works as Goar, Euchologium or Rituale Græcorum ; Renaudot, Liturgiarum Orientalium Collectio ; Mabillon, De Liturgiâ Gallicanâ ; Muratori, Liturgia Romana ; Assemani, Codex Liturgicus Ecclesiæ Universæ.

† Known in the Church of England as the Portiforium, or, as it was translated, the Portuis or Portess. Its origin may probably be traced to St. Benedict in the sixth century. It contained the daily services of the Church, as distinct from the Liturgy properly so called. The Missal contained the service for the Holy Communion, or Mass. The Manual contained the offices for baptism, visitation of the sick, &c.

“ His fantasy, still working,  
 Finds out another crotchet ;  
 Then runs he to the bishop,  
 And rides upon his rochet.” \*

CHAP.  
 VIII,  
 Matthew  
 Parker.  
 1559-75.

Of the great work of Osmund, Bishop of Salisbury, in the twelfth century, mention has been made in a former volume. † His object was to introduce uniformity throughout the English Church. “The Sarum Use,” referred to in the Preface of the Book of Common Prayer, was, to a considerable extent, successful. Although the York Use, the Hereford Use, and the Lincoln Use had all and each of them their several advocates ; yet, even in the dioceses in which these Uses were adopted in the cathedral, there were many churches which preferred and adhered to the Use of Sarum. If any one prayer book was to be adopted as national, no doubt existed as to which “Use” should be selected. Indeed, it will be within the memory of the reader, that the first decided step taken in the direction of liturgical reform consisted in an attempt to enforce the adoption, throughout the Church of England, of the “Sarum Use.” So popular was the Sarum Use in the fifteenth century, that it was adopted in Durham, in many of the churches of Scotland, and even in some of the continental churches.

From the fourteenth century onwards there grew up a general desire, that, as Augustine, our founder, had caused the Greek offices to be translated into Latin, when Latin was the common language of educated men.

\* Corbet

† It is sometimes said, that the Bishop of Salisbury being precentor of the province, Osmund reformed the Liturgy in that character ; but, on recurring to the subject, I found it cannot be shown that the Bishops of Sarum held the office of precentor at so early a period.



CHAP.  
VIII.Matthew  
Parker.

1559-75.

so now, when English had become the only language generally understood in a country where men were beginning to think for themselves, it would be expedient to translate the Latin offices into the vernacular. Among the ecclesiastical authorities, an inclination to meet the demand certainly prevailed. From the year 1390, when I believe the first English Primer made its appearance, an English version of certain portions of the Church services had from time to time been made and sanctioned.\* “Indeed,” says Mr. Maskell, “there never was a period in the history of the English Church, when care was not taken to enforce upon all priests the duty of teaching the people the rudiments of the faith in the vulgar tongue, and to provide books fitted for that purpose. Hence it is, that we have so many short expositions in English of the Creed, the Lord’s Prayer, and the Ten Commandments.”

The clergy had been fearfully negligent of their duty ; but, from what has been said, it will be seen that the way had long been prepared for the English reformers. We may trace the first decided step taken in favour of liturgical reform to the year 1516, and to the publication, under synodal authority, of a reformed edition of the Salisbury Breviary. In this edition the rubrics were simplified, and more ample provision was made for the reading of Scripture. So much did this measure commend itself to the judgment both of the clergy and of the laity, that, in the year 1531, a reprint of the new edition

\* For the history of Primers the reader is referred to Mr. Maskell. With reference to the three Primers published at Oxford by my learned friend the late Dr. Burton, Mr. Maskell observes, that the preface drawn up by that “excellent man, to whose labour the Church is much indebted, does not do justice to his acknowledged industry and ability.”

issued from the press. This was followed in 1533 by a bolder measure, a revised edition of the Salisbury Missal. In 1534, the clergy in convocation petitioned the king to command a translation of the Scripture to be made, and to authorize its perusal.

CHAP.  
VIII.

Matthew  
Parker.  
1559-75.

The demand was partially met by the publication of the Primers, to which allusion has been already made; and at length, in 1540, the "Great Bible," as it was called, was set up in the churches—an English authorized version of Scripture, the basis of all subsequent translations. In 1541 a further advance was made. Instead of the various Uses which had hitherto prevailed in the different dioceses of the Church of England, the Convocation directed that a further revision should be made of the Sarum Use; and, when it was finished, directions were given for its sole use throughout the province of Canterbury. In 1542, in the reign, be it observed, of Henry VIII., and after the passing of the Statute of Six Articles, the bishops, under the king's command, were again occupied in the work of liturgical reform. It was signified to the Convocation, by the Archbishop of Canterbury, Dr. Cranmer, that it was the king's pleasure that all books, Antiphoners and Portuises, should be examined, corrected, and reformed.\* Orders were issued to the bishops, requiring them to direct the curate of every parish church, on every Sunday and holiday throughout the year, after the Te Deum and Magnificat, to read a chapter of the New Testament in English, and when the New Testament had been read through, to begin the Old. For one hundred and fifty years the litanies used in processions had been sung in English. These the Archbishop of Canterbury, with the help of other prelates, undertook to revise; and they translated and re-arranged a litany almost identical

\* Strype's Memorials, i. 580.

CHAP.  
VIII.

Matthew  
Parker.  
1559-75.

with that which is still in use.\* It was published, by command of the king, on the 11th of June, 1544. Soon after the accession of Edward VI., the first Prayer Book, to which his name was attached, was finished,—a work at which the commissioners had laboured long and diligently; and for which the sanction of Convocation was obtained in November, 1548. The Book of Common Prayer was accepted as the “Use” of all England. The synod found that the book presented for their sanction contained all the essential features of the former Uses, avoiding the difficulties of which, in the complication of the services, the less learned of the clergy complained. With the dissolution of the monasteries the Regulars may be said to have ceased to have existence in the English Church. The Breviary, therefore, was no longer required; and the difference between the Breviary and the Book of Common Prayer was seen to consist in the fact, that the Prayer Book was adapted to parochial rather than to monastic purposes. The seven daily services observed in the monasteries were, in the revised book, condensed into matins and evensong. The lessons read in church were to be taken no longer from questionable legends, but exclusively from the sure word of Scripture. Many festival services were omitted. Extravagant expressions, relating to the Virgin Mary and other saints were discontinued, being regarded as interpolations of a date comparatively modern. What was primitive was retained; what was medieval was subjected to the test of Scripture. The book was sent by Convocation to the king, and by the king to Parliament. The Parliament declared their pious belief that the Book of Common Prayer was com-

\* Dr. Cranmer at that time retained addresses to the Virgin Mary and some of the saints—“*Ora pro nobis*,” but this error he shortly after renounced.

pleted by the INSPIRATION OF GOD THE HOLY GHOST; and they readily passed the first Act of Uniformity. Thus, gradually, was the work of the commission performed; thus, cautiously, was drawn up a "Use" which, having absorbed within itself what was scriptural and primitive in preceding Uses, has been the solid basis of all the subsequent proceedings of our Church in this direction.

In this Prayer Book, the queen, Parker, and Cecil found all that they regarded as absolutely necessary. What had been accomplished, had been done by the bishops, under the sanction of the crown; it had been supported by the Convocation; it had been submitted to Parliament; and it had been adopted by the Lords Spiritual and the Lords Temporal without alteration. The Book of Common Prayer being included in the Act of Uniformity, became a law of the land. The acts of Henry and of Edward bearing upon religion had been repealed under Mary, by whom new acts of Parliament had been obtained. These obnoxious acts being now re-enacted, Elizabeth was in the position of her brother at the beginning of his reign: she inherited the policy of her father, and to his wisdom she and her advisers were always accustomed to look back with respect. The bishops could not consistently interfere, because all that it was proposed to accomplish had already received their approbation. Convocation would not have to be consulted, for what was to be restored had been itself the work of Convocation. All that was required was, that the obnoxious acts of Mary should be repealed; and that the work of the bishops in a preceding convocation should, by a new Act of Uniformity, be re-adopted by the laity.

On the other hand, the ultra-Protestants, even those who were prepared to conform to the second Prayer Book of Edward, raised a clamour against the book of 1549. The

CHAP.  
VIII.

Matthew  
Parker.  
1559-75.



CHAP.  
VIII.Matthew  
Parker.

1559-75.

country had declared its belief, that the first Prayer Book had been reformed under Divine Inspiration ; there could therefore be nothing wrong in its principles : but alterations had nevertheless been made, and omissions tolerated, from a desire not to shock unnecessarily the prejudices of certain parties, whose co-operation was desired. In preparing the first book, the question had been simply, What is the truth? Parker and the English reformers, in revising that book, desired to adhere to the principle which had actuated their predecessors. The question, however, as it was, unfortunately, brought to bear upon the second book, was, How much can we, in charity, concede to the prejudices of the extreme Protestant party without absolutely cutting ourselves off from the Catholic Church? This was still the question with the returned exiles. Those among them who were Episcopalians were ready to conform, but on the condition that further concessions should be made, if it should be found expedient to make them.

Thus in the committee, two parties, though maintaining the most friendly relations with each other, were found to exist. One party was determined to render our formularies more Protestant ; while the English reformers, foreseeing that they would be obliged to yield on some points, were resolved to concede as little as possible.

The question was reduced to this, When we apply to Parliament for an Act of Uniformity, which Prayer Book shall we introduce into the bill? Cecil and Parker found it necessary to yield. It was difficult to persuade some of the best and most learned of their contemporaries to conform to the Church of England. The foreign Calvinists were eager to receive them, if they again left their native country. However unwilling the Puritans might be to leave their native land, they had given proof that they

would do so if necessary. If they would not come to terms, the government would be thrown upon the tender mercy of the Papists. The country, though not Protestant, was anti-Papistical, and in favour of a reformation ; and it was absolutely necessary to make terms with those among the Puritans who understood, that the continuity of the Church depended upon its episcopacy ; and who, in spite of the attempts made, with too much success, to pervert the exiles, had still some English feeling left.

It was at length conceded that the Second Book of Edward should be adopted. The difficulty was with the queen. Elizabeth was not accustomed to yield with a good grace. She had high notions of the prerogative, and no slight opinion of her powers of fascination and persuasion. Parker probably succeeded in persuading the queen to allow the Second Book of Edward to be adopted, by admitting, that although in that book there were some things to which he and the English reformers had serious objections, yet for the sanction of some alterations an appeal to the prerogative might be made, if not without observation, without causing offence. The primate had to proceed with caution. Some of the alterations received the unanimous approbation of the commissioners ; but then arose the question, How were these alterations to be effected ? If they acted according to precedent, these changes should be made to appear as suggestions of friendly divines, appointed under the great seal, to advise the crown ; and the suggestions adopted by the sovereign ought to be submitted by her to the Convocation. Convocation, having debated the whole subject, should authorize the alterations, and the sovereign send the corrected book to Parliament, that the Parliament might enact what the Church had enjoined. But the existing commission, not having been appointed under

CHAP.  
VIII.

Matthew  
Parker.

1559-75.

CHAP.  
VIII.

Matthew  
Parker.

1559-75.

the great seal, could only, in the eye of the law, be regarded as a committee of divines meeting privately to advise the queen's ministers. For reasons already mentioned, it would have been useless to offer the liturgical question for discussion in the existing Convocation, of which the upper house was under the influence of the president, the Bishop of London, Dr. Bonner ; Archdeacon Harpsfield being the prolocutor of the lower house. To dissolve the present Convocation, and to convene another, would consume so much time, even if there were not constitutional objections to the proceeding, that it would have been impossible to have a measure in readiness for the meeting of Parliament.

Cecil and Parker approached the subject as politicians, and the queen reluctantly acceded to the following proposals :—that the second Prayer Book should be sent to Parliament, to be embodied in the proposed Bill of Uniformity ; and that certain alterations, necessary to satisfy the queen's conscience, and to meet the views of the English reformers, should be made by an exercise of the royal prerogative.

At the present time, in a new reign, certain alterations are made in the Prayer Book, in accordance with the common law of the Church and the statute law of the realm, to adapt it to the altered circumstances of the royal family. Between the statute law and the common law, which invested the crown with certain prerogatives in things spiritual and temporal, of which it has been subsequently deprived, no distinction in Parker's time was made. On neither side—neither on the side of the commissioners, nor on the side of the bishops—was any objection taken to this mode of proceeding. The second Prayer Book, which had been reformed under the sanction of Convocation, was now to be submitted to Parliament ; and,

when an Archbishop of Canterbury should be appointed, it was left to him to have these proceedings endorsed by Convocation. Whatever may be thought of Parker's conduct on this occasion, anyone acquainted with the history of the times, must admit that he evinced remarkable sagacity and discretion. He laid it down as a rule through life, that it was wisdom occasionally to save a principle by sacrificing a detail. Whether he yielded too much or too little; whether we have lost by his occasional concessions, or gained by his general firmness—these are questions which every reader will decide for himself. Parker was distinguished, not for his genius, but for a very large share of common sense. In legislating for the Church he was called to discharge the duties of a statesman combined with those of a divine, and was often compelled by circumstances to consider, not what was best, but what was most practicable.

CHAP.  
VIII.

Matthew  
Parker.  
1559-75.

The alterations made were few in number. To conciliate one party, an intolerant expression was expunged from the Litany: "From the tyranny of the Bishop of Rome, and all his detestable enormities, good Lord, deliver us;" as was also the rubric, in which it was declared that no adoration was intended by the posture of kneeling in the Holy Sacrament; at the same time, to win favour with the opposite party, it was left to the discretion of the Ordinary to permit the prayers to be offered in the body of the church instead of the chancel. Proper lessons for Sundays were now fixed, and prayers for the queen, the clergy, and the people were introduced from ancient offices. In their desire to preserve the notion of the continuity of the Church, and to maintain external appearances, it was determined to rescind the rubric of 1552, and to retain, to a certain extent, the Catholic vestments.

Alter-  
ations in  
the Prayer  
Book.



CHAP.  
VIII.Matthew  
Parker.

1559-75.

Parker was both surprised and pleased to see how easily these alterations were admitted, when the Prayer Book was sent to parliament. In both houses they passed unnoticed, as being immaterial, and the book, notwithstanding the alterations, was received under the general designation of the Second Prayer Book of Edward VI. The fact is, that by one party a strong opposition was raised to the entire Bill of Uniformity, and the reforming party perceived, that if they would secure the Reformation, it was expedient to avoid a rupture among themselves. The Puritan party was contented, generally, with the retention of the second Prayer Book; the rejection of which, on the part of the commissioners who were of the Puritan party, would have implied a censure on the reformers of King Edward's reign, whom they claimed to represent, in opposition to the English reformers, who wished to take their stand on the reformation of Henry VIII. The English reformers were willing to yield the victory on this point to their friendly opponents in the commission, provided that they could secure the recognition of certain principles, the assertion of which, if not of vital importance, was due to their consistency.

Parlia-  
ment  
meets.  
Jan. 21,  
1559.

Before the commission had completed its work, parliament had met. One of the great difficulties with which the queen had to contend, was the exhausted state of the finances. There were not funds in the exchequer to meet the current expenses of the year, and the queen had inherited a debt which it was not for the honour of the crown to repudiate. The people were justly offended by the profligate expenditure of King Henry; by the alienation, to private purposes, of the public treasure on the part of King Edward's reformers; and by the alleged expenditure of English wealth for the furtherance of the objects of Spanish ambition. With these feelings they were impatient of taxation; while from the clergy,

robbed and impoverished, the large subsidies formerly imposed on them could no longer be extracted. The monasteries, which had been as banks, and the monks, who had been as brokers, to the English kings, no longer existed.

CHAP.  
VIII.  
Matthew  
Parker.  
1559-75.

The clergy were still unpopular and alarmed, and it was supposed that, for the protection of their persons, they would not resist an attack upon their purses. The first bill, offered to the house on the 30th of January, had for its object the surrender to the crown of the first-fruits and tenths of spiritual promotions. These had been appropriated to the use of the sovereign, by the piety, or the avarice, of Henry VIII., and their restoration to the clergy by Queen Mary was attributed to superstition. An apology seemed necessary for what appeared to be spoliation, and the government condescended to explain, that an act, not entirely to be justified, was rendered necessary by "the huge, innumerable, and inestimable charges" to which the queen was exposed. The lords spiritual nobly desired to defend the indisputable property of the Church of England, but were compelled to submit to a majority of the lords temporal. The conduct of the lords spiritual was at this time deserving of more praise than it has received; for although they bravely opposed the crown when robbing the Church, they tendered their loyal support to the second bill now introduced, which had for its object the recognition of Elizabeth's title to the throne, on the grounds of common and statute law. They evinced the same loyal feeling when two other bills were introduced against treasonable and seditious attacks upon the queen. The loyal conduct of the bishops, while acting in opposition to the government, was not forgotten by the queen. It may, indeed, be said, that they exhibited, for the first time, an instance of a

Loyalty  
of the  
bishops.

CHAP.  
VIII.Matthew  
Parker.

1559-75.

constitutional opposition in parliament, by which it was shown, that liberty of speech is not inconsistent with due deference to the powers that be. It is important to notice this conduct on the part of these diocesans, for it clearly proves that their religion was quite distinct from that of the seminary priests—to whom attention will be presently called—who represented the assassination of an excommunicated heretic, though an anointed sovereign, as a religious act.

Act of Su-  
premacy.  
1559.

The difficulty in passing the bill relating to the royal supremacy was great. It was opposed by the extremes on both sides, both by the Puritans and by the Papists; and it was not until the title of Head of the Church was repudiated by the queen, that, being opposed by the lords spiritual to the last, it at length obtained the consent of the lords temporal. The act, professing to restore to the crown the ancient jurisdiction over the estates of the realm, whether spiritual or temporal, declared that, whatever rights, privileges, or spiritual pre-eminences had been formerly in use, and established by any ecclesiastical authority whatever, for visiting the clergy, and correcting all kinds of error, heresy, and schism, with other abuses and disorders, should remain for ever annexed to the imperial crown of England. It was added, that the queen and her successors might be empowered to give their letters patent to some particular persons, for the due exercise of that authority; on this condition, however, “that they should not determine anything to be heresy but what had been so defined, time out of mind, either from canonical scripture, the four œcumenical councils, or some other, according to the genuine sense of holy writ.” It was further required, that ecclesiastical persons and magistrates, graduates in the university, and others holding office under the crown, should, when re-

quired, make oath to acknowledge the queen to be the supreme governor of her kingdom in all causes, as well spiritual as civil. The act representing the Bishop of Rome as a foreign prince and potentate excluded him and the Roman courts from taking cognizance of any cause within the dominions of the queen ; and the way was unfortunately prepared for the High Commission Court.

CHAP.  
VIII.  
Matthew  
Parker.  
1559-75.

The bill had been drawn up by Cecil with Parker's aid, and with the unwilling consent of the queen. The immense powers vested in the crown seemed necessary to restrain the excesses on either extreme, though, being wrong in principle, the act was afterwards fearfully abused. Parker, together with the English reformers under his influence, was reconciled to it, because it gave royal and parliamentary weight to those church principles on which they sought to reform the Church. The extremes on either side were accustomed to appeal—the one side to Rome, the other to Geneva: Parker and his supporters could now set these appeals at defiance, for their authority was the tradition of the primitive Church as corrected by a reference to Holy Scripture. The Papists deferred to the authority of the pope without regard to Scripture. The Puritans accepted scriptural authority, but interpreted it according to the opinions of Calvin. The English reformers equally deferred to Scripture, but employed Scripture as the means of testing that primitive tradition, which had been carefully guarded and handed down from the first ages of Christianity. Other enactments of this parliament, as bearing upon the religious questions of the day, reflect great credit upon Cecil and Parker. Provision was made for the election, confirmation, and consecration of the episcopate within the realm, without any foreign interference, and for the appointment of suffragan bishops. The law of marriage



CHAP.  
VIII.

Matthew  
Parker.

1559-75.

was regulated so as to render dispensations no longer necessary; doctors of civil law were permitted, though married, to hold ecclesiastical jurisdiction. Communion in both kinds having been restored to the laity, precaution was taken against those blasphemous remarks upon the Holy Sacrament which had been, to his shame, encouraged by Crumwell in the reign of Henry VIII., and not repressed in the subsequent reign by Somerset. Irreverent speeches against the Eucharist were rendered punishable by statute law. Although the royal supremacy was asserted, yet, as is well observed by a writer whose views incline to Erastianism,\* no power was claimed by any act in this parliament on behalf of the crown, beyond its inherent right to the supreme regulation of ecclesiastical affairs within the limits of its ordinary jurisdiction. The Act of Uniformity came into force on the festival of St. John the Baptist, June 24.

Spoliation  
Bill.

Parker was at variance with the queen on one point, for he resisted the passing of an unjustifiable and oppressive act, by virtue of which authority was given to her majesty, on the avoidance of any archbishopric or bishopric, to take into her hands any of the landed property of the see, recompensing the party robbed with parsonages impropriate or with tithes. Against this act the diocesans also raised their voice in parliament; and Parker and the other bishops elect, even before their consecration, protested.

Many of the sees were at this time vacant, and the queen was enabled, through the provisions of this act, to fill her own coffers very frequently, and to gratify her least deserving courtiers with the best episcopal lands and revenues throughout England. In lieu of what was

\* Soames, iv. 641.

taken from the bishoprics, parsonages, which had originally belonged to the monasteries, were made over to the sees ; but many of them were burdened with decayed chancels and ruinous houses, and with the payment of various pensions. Archbishop Parker, in conjunction with four other bishops, at a subsequent period, offered the queen a thousand marks a year during their lives, not to use the liberty granted under this act, but to no effect ; for she appointed a commission to survey the property of the bishops when any bishopric was vacant, to send certificates into the exchequer of the value of their several lands and revenues, and to advise as to what she should take into her own hands, and as to the impropriations and tithes to be granted instead of them to the bishops. Although a compulsory change may be the very highest act of injustice, yet she chose to consider such exchanges as no wrong or robbery. The estates of the Archbishopric of Canterbury suffered so considerably, that Parker was frequently distressed for want of money,\* and sometimes found it difficult to maintain his establishment. It was by only a small majority that the bill passed the Commons on the 17th of April ; for the Commons had learned by experience, that although the measure was commended to their notice, as a means of diminishing the general taxation of the country, the only persons who would be really benefited would be the queen herself and her courtiers.

The speeches of those prelates who were members of parliament when the various bills for the reformation of the Church were introduced have been preserved by D'Ewes. Their arguments are easily refuted ; but, in saying this, we bring to our criticism of their rhetoric,

CHAP.  
VIII.

Matthew  
Parker.

1559-75.

Speeches  
of the  
Lords  
Spiritual.

\* Strype's Annals, I. i. 96 ; Fuller, iv. 315.

CHAP.  
VIII.  
Matthew  
Parker.  
1559-75.

rather than their logic, the experience and wisdom of subsequent ages; during which period arguments have been duly weighed, and the stern realities of history distinguished from ingenious conjectures of the imagination. In the sixteenth century, theology was nearly confined to professed divines; and the divines in the House of Lords being all on one side, the arguments and historical misstatements of the lords spiritual were met by a silent majority.

Discontent  
of Protest-  
ants.

Under these circumstances the Protestants had just ground for complaint; and their complaints received the more ready attention from the fact, that the conciliation of their party had now become the policy of the government. The report went forth, that right had been compelled to yield to might, and that while all the votes were on one side, the argument was on the other. In modern times it may be supposed, that the Protestants would have been heard by counsel at the bar of the house; but lawyers had ceased to be ecclesiastics, and, as the object of the Protestant leaders was not to win a cause, but to establish the truth, they desired to commit the discussion to men mighty in the Scriptures, rather than to skilful lawyers simply employed to win a cause, not difficult to win when the judges had arrived at a foregone conclusion. According to the opinions of the age, there was justice in this plea; and, at the same time, the government could not advise the queen to convert the House of Lords into an arena of religious controversy. It was determined, therefore, that a theological debate, assuming the form of a conference, should be held in Westminster Hall. Such conferences, or public discussions, are, in our days, worse than useless. Their tendency is to add personal bitterness to the acrimony of polemics; but at a time when the press was in its infancy,

when public journals had scarcely come into notice,\* and when among the people few could read, the government acted wisely in acceding to the proposal for a public discussion between the two great parties, the Romanizers and the ultra-Protestants; and in so arranging the accessories of the meeting, as to give it an important and national character.

It was left to Archbishop Heath to select the divines who were to argue on his side of the question, and the Protestant disputants were chosen by Bishop Scory.

The questions to be brought under discussion were the following: I. Whether the sacraments ought to be celebrated in the vulgar tongue? II. Whether the Church has authority to alter ceremonies, provided all be done to edification? III. Whether the mass be a propitiatory sacrifice?

Dr. Parker did not take any prominent part in this debate; into a detailed account of which, therefore, I am not called upon to enter. There can be little doubt, however, that the conference met with Parker's approbation; and probably it would not have been held if he had not advised it. But Parker was not himself qualified to act as a literary gladiator. He could supply arguments to others; but he was nervous: he was conscious of that want of readiness of repartee, so important on such occasions; and to this we must add, that he was still an invalid.

\* It is generally supposed that the first printed newspapers in England were published in 1588, when England was threatened with an invasion by the Spanish Armada, and the government issued *The English Mercuria*, published by authority, for the prevention of false reports. But in Wright's *History of Queen Elizabeth and her Times*, a letter, written in 1564 by Cecil, refers to "a printed letter of truth." *The Mercury* of 1588 was, as the editor remarks, the first adoption by the government of a practice already become general.



CHAP.  
VIII.Matthew  
Parker.

1559-75.

West-  
minster  
Con-  
ference,  
March 31,  
1559.

On the 31st of March, the Colloquy was held in great state in Westminster Hall. Lord Keeper Bacon presided, with the express understanding that he did not take the chair to overrule any point in the controversy; but merely, under a royal commission, to take precaution that due order was preserved. Soon after Bacon's appointment, the government, in order to show with what fairness it desired to act, associated with the lord keeper the Archbishop of York. The proceedings occasioned considerable excitement. "Great," says Bishop Jewel, "were the expectations of the people;" but due order was observed. Certain regulations for the conduct of the debate had been drawn up, it is supposed, by Cecil, and to those regulations both parties gave their assent.

In this Colloquy, Horne, afterwards Bishop of Winchester, distinguished himself, and laid down with great clearness the principles upon which the English reformation had proceeded.

Bishop  
Horne's  
speech.

"Forasmuch" (he said) "as we have for our mother *the true and Catholic Church of Christ*, which is grounded upon the doctrine of the Apostles and prophets, and is of Christ the head of all things governed, we do reverence her judgment; we obey her authority as becometh children; and we do devoutly profess, and in all points follow, the faith which is contained in the three creeds; that is to say, of the Apostles, of the Council of Nice, and of Athanasius.

"And seeing that we never departed, neither from the doctrine of God, which is contained in the holy canonical Scriptures, nor yet from the faith of the true and Catholic Church of Christ, but have preached truly the word of God, and have sincerely ministered the sacraments according to the institution of Christ, unto the which our doctrine and faith the most part also of our adversaries did subscribe not many years past (although now, as unnatural, they are revolted from the same), we desire that they render account of their backsliding, and

show some cause wherefore they do not only resist that doctrine, which they have before professed, but also persecute the same by all the means they can.

“We do not doubt but through the equity of the queen’s most excellent majesty, we shall in these disputations be entreated more gently than in years late past, when we were handled most unjustly and scanty, after the common manner of men.

“As for the judgment of the whole controversy, we refer unto the most Holy Scriptures and the Catholic Church of Christ, whose judgment unto us ought to be most sacred. Notwithstanding by the *Catholic* Church we understand, not the *Romish* Church, whereunto our adversaries attribute such reverence, but that which St. Augustine and other fathers affirm ought to be sought in the Holy Scriptures, which is governed and led by the Spirit of Christ.”

With the full concurrence of Archbishop Heath, if not at his suggestion, it was arranged that each side should tender their judgments in writing, and in the vulgar tongue; and that the Romanizers were to begin the discussion, and the Protestants to answer.

The first day’s debate was conducted with due decorum, but the Romanizing party soon discovered their inferiority to the Protestants, both in learning and in eloquence. On the second day, therefore, they refused to abide by the orders that, with the full concurrence of the archbishop, had been previously agreed upon. They asserted, that the multitude was prejudiced against them; and they complained that the lord keeper was their avowed enemy, forgetting that the Archbishop of York, their avowed friend, was the lord keeper’s assessor. In vain did the good Archbishop of York entreat them to act reasonably and consistently. They refused, on the second day, to be any longer bound by the terms that, on the first day, had been con-

CHAP.  
VIII.

Matthew  
Parker.  
1559-75.

Reference  
to Scrip-  
ture and  
Catholic  
tradition.

Conference  
inter-  
rupted.

CHAP.  
VIII.Matthew  
Parker.

1559-75.

sidered equitable. One of their number, indeed, more candid than the rest, plainly confessed, that if the last word should be with the Protestants, they would conclude with the applause of the assembly; as if the public applause of the meeting, instead of the maintenance of the truth, were their object—not verity, but party. The Bishops of Winchester and Lincoln conducted themselves on this occasion with so much indecorum, and even violence, that the people, remembering the horrors of the late reign, were exasperated against them to such an extent, that it was found expedient, for their protection, to place these prelates for the remainder of the week under surveillance.\* “And so,” says the quaint old historian, Fuller, “in this disputation there was more noise than fruit, more passion than reason, and more cavils than argument.”†

Result of  
the con-  
ference.

The result of the conference was to convince the government, that whatever might be the private opinion of Archbishop Heath and the majority of his episcopal coadjutors, they formed a party which, under foreign influence, was determined to carry on, *à toute outrance*, an opposition to Elizabeth’s government, and to the measures devised for the reformation of the Church. They knew not the firmness of Elizabeth and the wisdom of her counsellors, for they had not yet been tested; but they might have understood, that the readiness of the government to make concessions to their prejudices was not the result of fear: it was rather the dictate of a sound policy and a desire to conciliate. The conduct of these

\* They were committed for contempt of court: this is expressly stated in the declaration of the Proceedings of Conference in the volume entitled *Synodalia*, in the Library of Corpus Christi College, Cambridge, No. cxxi. Art. 21.

† Fuller, iv. 271.

diocesans, after their deposition, made it manifest that the differences between them and the English reformers were not so great as to render a reconciliation impossible; and this is a justification of the queen and her advisers, Cecil and Parker, when they cherished, if not an expectation, yet a hope, that the two parties, by mutual concessions, might be induced to work together for the public good. The hope was not extinguished in Elizabeth's mind until the consecration of Parker rendered it no longer possible for the two extremes to come to terms.

The condition of the hierarchy on the accession of Elizabeth was very precarious. The plague, which was raging in the last year of Queen Mary's reign, had caused a remarkable mortality among the bishops. Four had died just before her decease, and six immediately after; so that ten sees were vacant, and, among those that remained, three were filled by prelates who might be regarded as intruders. The predecessor of Dr. Heath, Archbishop Holgate, had been illegally deposed in March, 1553. Archbishop Heath, therefore, had no ground of complaint when, on his refusal to obey the laws of the realm, he was required by those upon whom the administration of the laws devolved, to give place to another prelate duly nominated and elected. Bishop Barlow also, who afterwards presided at the consecration of Parker, had been compelled to resign the see of Bath and Wells, of which Dr. Bourne took possession. Other instances might be produced of appointments more or less irregular, through the interference of the government in Queen Mary's reign. This is said, not with a view of permitting one party to retaliate upon another, but merely to show that the circumstances of the times rendered some irregularities, not in principle, but in detail, a matter of necessity.

CHAP.  
VIII.  
Matthew  
Parker.  
1559-75.

Condition  
of the  
hierarchy.

In deposing certain diocesans politically opposed to



CHAP.  
VIII.Matthew  
Parker.

1559-75.

her, it will thus be observed, that Elizabeth was only following the precedent which had been established by her sister. They may both have been in error, but the one cannot be more censurable than the other; and, after all has been taken into consideration, we find it said by Sir William Palmer, that, whether right or wrong, in every nation the government has assumed the power of depriving diocesans, not of their episcopal orders, but of their temporalities and jurisdiction, when these bishops have refused obedience to the laws of the realm.

Diocesans  
summoned  
before the  
Privy  
Council.

The surviving diocesans were summoned, soon after the dissolution of parliament, on the 15th of May, together with some of the leading divines of their party, to appear before the Privy Council. Great formality was observed, for the purpose of marking the solemnity of the occasion. At the head of the council table sat the queen herself; and ridiculous as might be the airs assumed by Elizabeth when she was surrounded only by her courtiers, yet, on great occasions, her dignity of demeanour and her presence of mind were such as to overawe the persons who came into her presence, or who ventured to dispute her will. She called the attention of the prelates to the Act of Supremacy passed in the late parliament; and she pointed out to them, that an oath to observe the act was by that statute required of all functionaries in Church or State. To the requirements of an act of the legislature she now called upon them to yield obedience. She urged them, as loyal subjects, to comply; and she invited them to co-operate with her in her determination "to abolish superstition from the worship of the Church."

The  
queen's  
speech to  
the pre-  
lates.

Reply of  
the Arch-  
bishop of  
York.

In the most respectful manner Archbishop Heath replied, that, by several diocesans in both provinces, he had been commissioned to move her majesty, that she would

be pleased to recollect the zeal towards the holy see of St. Peter shown by the late queen her sister. He predicted that, unless the present government would adhere to the engagements of that princess, the kingdom would lie under perpetual ignominy and disgrace.

CHAP.  
VIII.

Matthew  
Parker.

1559-75.

These great dignitaries of the Church stood before a young woman, surrounded by untried counsellors, and exposed to the threatened hostility of the great continental powers. They stood before one who could ill afford to convert into opponents those prelates who commanded, as it was well known, the good will of the continental princes. But they also stood before one in whose nature the fire of indignation was sure to be inflamed by a threat; who, although she did not hesitate to give play to her passions, when she could do so with impunity, could nevertheless command her temper when its control was politically expedient, or when she had any great purpose to accomplish. They stood before a master mind; and though they had not yet discovered her force of character, this only made their own insignificance the more apparent.

With firmness and dignity the Queen of England replied:—

“As for me and my house, we will serve the Lord. Resolved to act like King Josiah, who gathered together the elders of Judah that, under their advice, he might make a covenant with his God, I lately convened my clergy and my parliament. My object was to bind myself and my people, not under the Roman see, but to the Lord my God. My sister's power did not extend to contract the obligations which have just been mentioned. Our records on this entry show, that the papal jurisdiction over this realm was a usurpation, and the statute which has just been enacted they fully justify. It is by diving into and following the proceedings, which have come down to me from a long line of predecessors, that I mean to rule; and I hope

The  
queen's  
reply to  
the Arc-  
bishop of  
York.

CHAP.  
VIII.Matthew  
Parker.  
1559-75.

that in this my successor will follow my example. To no power whatever is my crown subject, save to that of Christ the King of kings. I shall therefore regard as enemies, both to God and myself, all such of my subjects as shall henceforth own any foreign or usurped authority within my realm." \*

The prelates were silent. The majority, if not all of them, had already, in the reign of King Henry, subscribed to the royal supremacy, and some had even written in its favour against the pope. An instinctive feeling kept them silent. In refusing to concede to the queen that obedience to her law, which they had not hesitated to render to her father, they had insulted her by implying the comparative weakness of her government. If they had said, that their opinions had undergone a change, the answer would have been obvious, namely, that, if their new principles were insisted on, their advice was not worthy of attention. The queen indirectly challenged them; and whether they should accept the challenge, or in what manner they could do so, was to them a most perplexing question. The pope had denied the right of Elizabeth to the crown; that right was assumed throughout her address by the queen, and, in doing so, she only claimed the rights she had derived from her ancestors. If there had been a great man among the prelates, he would have risked an answer, though it might have placed his life in peril; but, without consultation with one another, the prelates were afraid to speak; and we add that, as their subsequent conduct proved, they were not all of them hearty in the cause they were made to represent. They were silent, and were bowed out of the royal presence.

On their return to their homes they were met by more violent partizans, by whom they were urged to

\* Strype's Annals, I. i. 207; Bramhall, i. 116, 117.

renew the attack, and to make one final appeal to the youthful sovereign. A letter, the result of a consultation, was presented to the queen, which was signed by Heath, Bonner, Bourne, Tuberville, and Pool. In this letter her majesty was entreated not to permit herself to be led astray by the advice of evil counsellors, from the Catholic faith, "planted within this realm by the motherly care of the Church of Rome." Once more was she exhorted to follow the example of her sister, Queen Mary, and to consider the supremacy of the Church of Rome. It was a weak production, evidently composed, not with any hope of convincing the queen, but from a feeling, not to be censured, that it was fitting on their part to address a last exhortation to their young sovereign, before they were compelled to retire from the high stations they had hitherto occupied.

In the reply the hand of Parker is legible. Elizabeth was not ambitious, like her father and brother, of the character of a theologian; and she did not think it necessary that every document published in her name should be actually of her own composition. What she commanded to be written, she made her own by revision. The answer was firm and decided. "Our realm and subjects," she wrote, "have been long wanderers, walking astray, whilst they were under the tuition of Romish pastors who advised them to own a wolf for their head in lieu of a careful shepherd; whose inventions, heresies, and schisms be so numerous, that the flock of Christ have fed on poisonous shrubs for want of wholesome pastures. And whereas you hit us and our subjects in the teeth, that the Romish Church first planted the Catholic faith in our realms, the records and chronicles of our realms testify the contrary." She asserted, that "when Austin came from Rome, this her realm had bishops and priests

CHAP.  
VIII.

Matthew  
Parker.  
1559-75.  
Address to  
the queen.

The  
queen's  
reply.



CHAP.  
VIII.Matthew  
Parker.

1559-75.

therein as was well known to the wise and learned." Descending to personalities, she showed how some of the very prelates who were now addressing her, received their appointments from Henry VIII. after he had withdrawn from the supremacy of Rome; and she contended, therefore, that on their present principles they were themselves schismatical and heretical; "and whereas," she continued, "you would frighten us by telling how emperors, kings, and princes have owned the Bishop of Rome's authority, it was contrary in the beginning. For our Saviour Christ paid his tribute unto Cæsar as the chief superior, which shows your Romish supremacy is usurped." She alluded to the courage with which St. Athanasius withstood the heresies which had crept into the Church of Rome, and how he got the victory. "Do ye not acknowledge his creed to this day? Dare any of you say he is a schismatic? Surely ye are not so audacious? Therefore, as ye acknowledge his creed, it shows he was no schismatic. If Athanasius withstood Rome for her then heresies, then others may safely separate themselves from your Church, and not be schismatics. We give you warning that, for the future, we hear no more of this kind, lest you provoke us to execute those penalties enacted for the punishing of our resisters, which out of our clemency we have forborne."

Prayer  
Book well  
received.

When the Act for the Use of the Revised Prayer Book came into force, it became apparent that of the religious parties neither extreme had any influence worthy of being taken into consideration with the great body of the clergy and laity of the Church of England. Among the leaders on either side, among both Papists and ultra-Protestants, there were men of learning, of zeal, and of piety; but while they waged controversy one with another, the bulk of the clergy and of the people remained unmoved; and

among them the question was, not whether alterations might lawfully be made, but how they were to be carried out. Of 9,400 parochial clergy, not more than a hundred refused to conform to the Prayer Book. If, therefore, an historian were to speak of the unanimity with which the Prayer Book was received, his statement would be much nearer the truth than such general statements usually are. By the uncharitable, who look out for or suspect, in the very best actions, the predominance of base motives, the clergy are represented as so many Gallios caring for none of these things. This is a hard sentence to be pronounced upon more than 9,400 men, set apart for the service of their Saviour and their God; and it is scarcely want of charity to conjecture, that it is from a consciousness of wrong motives in themselves, that these accusers of the brethren venture to suggest charges for which it is impossible, in the nature of things, that proof can be adduced. For these suspicions and insinuations the impartial historian must be aware that there can be no necessity; for he cannot but know that, from the condition of the Church at this period, what really took place was precisely what might be expected to occur. The regulars—admitting individual exceptions—had for a long time been the only clergy in England who were, as a body, adherents to the papacy or advocates of the papal supremacy.\* As a body the regular clergy had been, by the dissolution of the monasteries, destroyed. Of the regulars, some were permitted to expatriate themselves, others obtained admission into

CHAP.  
VIII.

Matthew  
Parker.  
1559-75.

The regular clergy the advocates of the papal supremacy.

\* In those churches in which there are monasteries, the clergy attached to the monasteries are called *regulars*; the other clergy are called *seculars*. Before the Reformation the number of regulars in our Church was great; since the Reformation we have only had secular clergy.

CHAP.  
VIII.Matthew  
Parker.

1559-75.

aristocratic families as chaplains; where, being many of them gentlemen and men of learning, they did essential disservice to the cause of the Reformation by sowing the seeds of discontent among the nobles of the land. It is thus that we may account for the fact, that, at the very time when the people were becoming more Protestant, so many of the aristocratic families were prepared to aid the cause of Rome. The regulars were ever ready to take the lead in every insurrectionary movement; and, when the time came for the seminary priests to carry on their iniquitous warfare against the life of the queen and the peace of the realm, it was in these quarters that they found their allies.

The secular clergy  
in favour  
of the Re-  
formation.

Among the secular clergy, on the contrary, the monasteries had always been unpopular; and to this circumstance, in part, may be attributed the little resistance which was offered to their dissolution. An attack upon the reformed Prayer Book, on the part of the regulars, would have been a recommendation of it to the seculars. It is, therefore, to other causes that we must attribute the nonconformity of which, in the early part of Parker's episcopate, complaint was sometimes made. In the towns, the opposition was generally factious. In the provinces, the non-observance of the new rites was owing to stupidity rather than to perverseness. The seculars were among the least learned of the clerical body. It was difficult with them to break off old habits, and the difficulty sometimes became the greater, from their being unable to understand why an order was given, or what it meant. They could obey, but they could not always enter into the theory or principle which induced their superiors to change one form or ceremony for another. The secular clergy were thus, in some places, slow in making those alterations in the service of the Church

which were occasioned by the introduction of the Prayer Book ; \* but their hearts being with the Reformation, they gradually became more regular in their conformity ; and thus the next generation became attached to the reformed ceremonial to which they had been accustomed from their early years. Before the death of Queen Elizabeth, the tendency to Rome had, so far as the bulk of the nation was concerned, disappeared, and the English reformers found themselves thwarted by assailants from the opposite extreme.

CHAP.  
VIII.

Matthew  
Parker.

1559-75.

The time had now arrived when it became necessary to take measures to fill the vacant sees. And here we must pause to remark on the ignorance, or the wilful misrepresentation, which would make it appear that the fact which lies at the very foundation of the Church—the Apostolical Succession—was regarded as a thing indifferent by the English reformers. If such had been the case, we may fairly ask, Why was there so much delay in making appointments to the bishoprics ? If that consecration, by which the grace of holy orders is handed on from one generation to another, was not of vital importance, why did not the queen at once, as is still done in some parts of Germany, appoint superintendents with the episcopal title ? She might have invested them with legal powers for the government of certain ecclesiastical districts, and she might have placed them under the dominion of a minister of state, with endowments sufficient to enable him to conduct with dignity the quasi-spiritual functions, which, by the will of par-

Apos-  
tolic suc-  
cession.

\* This accounts for the fact that, until the suspension of the Church at the Great Rebellion, various ceremonies were observed, which were not resumed at the Restoration ; and this also accounts for the deficiencies in our rubrics. It was taken for granted that, when it was not otherwise enjoined, the clergy would continue to do as they had done before.



CHAP.  
VIII.

Matthew  
Parker.

1559-75.

liament, might devolve upon him. The answer we possess is the Ordinal itself, in which it is said :—

“It is evident unto all men diligently reading the Holy Scripture and ancient authors, that from the Apostles’ time there have been these orders of ministers in Christ’s Church ; bishops, priests, and deacons. Which offices were evermore had in such reverend estimation, that no man might presume to execute any of them, except he were first called, tried, examined, and known to have such qualities as are requisite for the same ; and also by publick prayer, with imposition of hands, were approved and admitted thereunto by lawful authority.” \*

\* Ordinal, Preface. This office was drawn up in the year 1549, by six archbishops and bishops, and six other divines. Upon this whole subject see Bilson’s *Perpetual Government of Christ’s Church*, especially chapters xii. and xiii. In this early and learned work the subject is almost exhausted. Thomas Bilson, Bishop of Winchester, was born in the year 1547. During a considerable portion of his life, therefore, he was a contemporary of Archbishop Parker, and was one of the English reformers. Among his contemporaries few are his equals, none his superiors, in learning and eloquence. The work is well edited by the Rev. Robert Eden, to whom we are indebted for the verification of the numerous quotations. See also the works of Archbishop Bramhall, the value of which has been much increased by the learned notes and appendices of Mr. Haddan, the editor. He has judiciously summed up the result of his labours in an original volume on the *Apostolical Succession of the Church of England*, written in the spirit and with the learning of Bilson. The work of Mr. Haddan is the more useful to the student, from the fact of his being able to meet, and in the most satisfactory manner to refute, objections which have been started since the sixteenth century, and by those who consider that no credentials are necessary to justify a man in assuming the office of an ambassador for God most high. The reader may be referred to the *Registrum Sacrum* of Professor Stubbs, of which Mr. Haddan affirms, that it is “the one complete and thorough work upon the subject.” Sir William Palmer, in his treatise on the Church, states the fact and the doctrine with his usual conciseness. All these writers are of course deeply indebted to Courayer, whose *Defence of Anglican Orders* is the more valuable from the fact of

In composing the Ordinal, which forms a portion of the Prayer Book, the reformers could not have intended to write nonsense ; and yet they would certainly have been guilty of making an assertion without meaning, if, in speaking of the episcopal office, they had not employed the title of Bishop in the sense which has always been attached to it in the Catholic Church ; of the doctrines of which Church they professed to be the exponents. The distinction to be made between a bishop and a priest, or presbyter, has always been, that to the bishop pertains, and to him exclusively, the right of ordination to the Christian ministry ; so that anyone who is not episcopally ordained, although the laws of the land may

CHAP.  
VIII.

Matthew  
Parker.

1559 75.

his being a foreigner and a Romanist. In various treatises published on this subject by Chancellor Harington, such a mass of learning has been brought to bear upon it, that it is to be regretted that his *Collectanea* has not been presented to the reader in one volume. In all that bears upon Parker's consecration, the work lately published by Dr. Lee is of great importance. Every writer upon this portion of ecclesiastical history must acknowledge his obligations to Mr. Bailey, who, in his *Ordinum Sacrorum in Ecclesiâ Anglicanâ Defensio*, has published the various documents affecting the validity of English orders, which have hitherto been only approachable after numerous journeys to the metropolis and the two universities, with a facsimile of the record of Archbishop Parker's consecration, photozincographed by permission of his Grace the Lord Archbishop of Canterbury from the register in the archiepiscopal library at Lambeth. I must not here omit the name of my late friend Mr. Arthur Perceval, who at my request composed his treatise on the Apostolical Succession, and completed it with that logical precision for which he was remarkable. Among the numerous works which have appeared on this subject, I shall only mention further Mason's *Vindiciæ Ecclesiæ Anglicanæ*, Bishop Taylor's *Episcopacy Asserted*, Hickes's *Dignity of the Episcopal Order*, and Madox's *Vindication of the Government, Doctrine, and Worship of the Church of England*. But the reader who would see the whole doctrine stated with a conciseness only surpassed by its accuracy of statement, and logical precision, may be referred to "The Apostolical Succession in the Church of England," by Professor Stubbs.

CHAP.  
VIII.

Matthew  
Parker.

1559-75.

permit him to assume the titles, which the Nonconformist Puritans of old repudiated and condemned, and of which modern Nonconformists are inconsistently ambitious, is not a minister of the Catholic Church. In making this assertion, it is our business, not to prove a doctrine, but simply to state, as is now done, an historical fact. How far that fact may be in accordance with scriptural principles is another question, though a question which is regarded by a Catholic as of easy solution.

We have, in the passage just quoted from the Prayer Book, an exposition of the faith of the English reformers; and that this was their faith may be shown still further by a reference to the declaration made of the functions and divine institution of bishops in the "Institution of a Christian Man" and "The Necessary Doctrine." Parker and the English reformers believed, as the Catholic Church has always believed, that as the Lord Jesus Christ was sent by the Father, so were the Apostles sent by Him. "As my Father hath sent me," saith our Lord, soon after his resurrection, "even so send I you." Now *how* had the Father sent Him? He had sent Him to act as his supreme minister on earth; as such, to appoint under Him subordinate ministers, and, to do what He then did when his work on earth was done, to hand on his commission to others. The Apostles, in like manner, were sent by Christ to act as his chief ministers in the Church, to appoint subordinate ministers under them, and then to do as He had done, to hand on their commission to others.

The Church then incorporated became a society which never dies, an immortal body, retaining for ever the privileges and powers with which it was originally invested by its founder. Its one object as a body, its business as an incorporated society, is to prepare the

world for the second coming of our Lord, by causing the Gospel to be preached to every creature as God provides the opportunity. If the Church, in any of its branches, is not making converts by home and foreign missions, it is not, in that place, answering the purpose for which it was instituted.

Individuals are saved by Faith in the one and only Saviour, our Lord Jesus Christ ; but the Church, or the aggregate of believers, is a society incorporated to bear a part in that mysterious scheme, devised in the counsels of God, The Blessed Trinity, which, though only partially revealed to us at present, is now in progress. The Creator has designed the human family to answer some unknown purpose in the government of the universe. To this divine scheme, Satan and the demons of darkness are opposed ; the dominion of Satan is to be put down, and to be finally annihilated by the Messiah. This has been partially done at our Lord's first coming, and is to be completed at his second coming. For that second coming, the Church is to prepare the world. We are, as it were, on the spiritual battlefield ; and soldiers are to be continually enlisted to fight under the banner of the great Captain of our salvation. Whatever may be the condition of others, those, and those only, who fight the Lord's battles, and, like their Divine Master, endure hardship, will sit with Him on his throne, and share his glory. Between living and reigning, between life and glory, a distinction can be made. Many, even among the heathen, may live and be happy hereafter ; for He who died, a propitiation for our sins, was a propitiation not for our sins only, but for the sins of the whole world ; but they who, having been admitted into the Church, shall escape condemnation at the day of judgment, are predestined, not to life only, but also to glory. When men regard

CHAP.  
VIII.

Matthew  
Parker.

1559-75.



CHAP.  
VIII.Matthew  
Parker.

1559-75.

Christianity from a sectarian point of view, they think only of the salvation of souls. Whereas the churchman, whether Anglo-Catholic, Roman Catholic, or Greek, while not disregarding the salvation of souls as one end, sees also the necessity of supporting that one society which has been divinely instituted for other not less important purposes in the heavenly scheme.

To enter more into detail. The Apostles carried on the Church divinely instituted, admitting their converts into it by baptism. Baptism was necessary even for those who already believed, because baptism is the means of admitting believers and their children into the Church. To officiate among the persons thus baptized, the Apostles appointed subordinate ministers, priests, and deacons; and then of the kingdom of heaven thus constituted they formed, as it were, colonies. These became national or provincial churches, under a Divine Omnipresent Head, and over these the Apostles exercised episcopal superintendence; either holding an occasional visitation by summoning the clergy to meet them (as Saint Paul summoned to Miletus the clergy of Ephesus); or transmitting to them those pastoral addresses which, under the name of Epistles, form so important a portion of Holy Scripture. At length, however, it became necessary for the Apostles to proceed yet farther, and to do as their Lord had empowered them to do, to hand on their commission to others, that, at their own death, the government of the Church and its several branches might not be extinct. Of this we have an instance in Titus, who was placed in Crete by Saint Paul to act as chief pastor or bishop; and another in Timothy, who was in like manner set over the Church of Ephesus. When Timothy was thus appointed to the office of chief pastor, he was associated with Saint Paul, who, in writing to the

Philippians, commences his salutation thus: "Paul and Timotheus to the servants of Jesus Christ, who are at Philippi, with the bishops and deacons." Now we have here the three orders of the ministry clearly alluded to. The title of Bishop is doubtless given to the second order; it is not, however, for words, but for things that we are to contend. Titles may be changed while offices remain: so senators exist, though they are not of necessity old men; and most absurd would it be to contend that, when we speak of the Emperor Constantine, we can mean that Constantine held no other office than that held under the Roman republic, because we find Cicero also saluted as Emperor. So stood the matter in the first age of the Gospel, when the chief pastors of the Church were generally designated Apostles or Angels, *i.e.* messengers sent by God Himself. In the next century, the office remaining, the designation of those who held it was changed, the title of Apostle was confined to the Twelve, including Saint Paul; and the chief pastors who succeeded them were thenceforth called Bishops, the subordinate ministers being styled Priests and Deacons. For when the name of Bishop was given to those who had that oversight of presbyters, which presbyters had of their flocks, it would have been manifestly inconvenient, and calculated to create confusion, to continue the episcopal name to the second order. Thus we see, as Christ was sent by the Father, so He sent the Apostles; as the Apostles were sent by Christ, so did they send the first race of bishops; as the first race of bishops was sent by the Apostles, so they sent the second race of bishops; the second the third; and so down to our present bishops, who thus trace their spiritual descent from Saint Peter and Saint Paul, and prove their divine authority to govern the churches over which they are canonically appointed to preside. The

CHAP.  
VIII.Matthew  
Parker.

1559-75.

CHAP.  
VIII.Matthew  
Parker.

1559-75.

three orders of the ministry in the New Testament stand thus: first order, Apostle; second order, Bishop, Presbyter or Elder; third order, Deacon. Afterwards, the office remaining the same, there was a change in the title, and the ministers of Christ were designated thus: first order, Bishop, formerly Apostle; second order, Presbyter or Elder; third order, Deacon.\*

Thus, in the opinion of the English reformers, the apostolical succession was of vital importance to the very existence of the Church universal and to its various branches. Without the apostolical succession, this continuity of the Church, and the organic identity of the present with the past, could not be preserved. The authorities in Church and State concurred in their belief that the continuity could not be sustained unless the archiepiscopal throne were occupied by one who could trace his authority to act, in things sacred, up to Augustine, through Augustine to the Apostles, and through them to the Divine Head, who breathed upon the apostolic college, saying, "Receive ye the Holy Ghost."

The question, therefore, now raised, was not as to the necessity of appointing a successor to Reginald Pole, duly consecrated; but as to the person on whose head the mitre, now vacant by his death, should be placed. No doubt was entertained upon the subject by the queen or by Cecil. It was felt, that no man was so well qualified to fill the vacant post as Matthew Parker—a man not of brilliant talents, but of sound judgment; who, in a revolutionary age, was opposed to rash innovations; whose

Primacy  
offered to  
Parker.

\* "Ab apostolis instituti sunt episcopi in ecclesiis, et successores eorum usque ad nos." Irenæus, iii. cap. 3. "They did not account it to be a church," says Hooker (Eccles. Polity, book vii. ch. v. p. 2.), "which was not subject unto a bishop. It was the general received persuasion of the ancient Christian world, that *ecclesia est in episcopo*, 'the outward being of a church consisteth in the having of a bishop.'"

principles were so firmly established that he could see how a matter of detail might be yielded for the conciliation of opponents, without the sacrifice of anything essential to the cause he desired to maintain.

CHAP.  
VIII.

Matthew  
Parker.  
1559-75.

On the other hand, Parker's reluctance to accept the archbishopric remained unaltered. But when he pleaded ill health and insufficiency of means, he was evidently not assigning the real grounds of his refusal: he was only seeking a pretext for declining a burden which he felt himself to be unequal to bear. He was not wealthy, but he had a competence, and was a member of a wealthy family: he had not good health, but his health did not prevent him from working, as we shall see, more perseveringly than most men. We gather from his diary and letters that he was a domestic man, and that he did not like to give up the comforts of a private home, or to place his wife, a lady by birth and education, in a doubtful position, which, so long as the queen was opposed to the marriage of the clergy, was likely to be the case. This difficulty, however, he overcame, and must have perceived that it was never insurmountable.

Parker's  
reluctance  
to accept  
it.

While, therefore, we admit that these pleas had, and had justly, their weight in his mind, we must look further for the real grounds of his *Nolo episcopari*.

It is clear, that he almost despaired of the fortunes of the Church. He saw Protestantism degenerating into Puritanism, and perceived that even the men with whom he would have to act, could not be depended upon. The queen and Cecil were cordially with him in principle and sentiment, but the queen was captious, and Cecil was a politician. We obtain a clue to Parker's history if we regard this despair of success as the cause of his disinclination to the primacy; and if we also bear it in mind that, when he became primate, it was with a de-



CHAP.  
VIII.Matthew  
Parker.  
1559-75.

sponding mind, determined to save what he could from the general ruin with which the Church was threatened. His one grand object, let it be repeated, was to save what he could; and there was much that he could only save by sacrificing, at the same time, some things he would gladly have retained, but the retention of which was not absolutely essential to the preservation of a Church. We may illustrate his position by what occurred at his consecration. He retained for us the apostolical succession; but he did so by curtailing the ceremonies of consecration, and by not insisting upon the mitre, the gloves, or the pastoral staff, the bestowal of which had for several centuries formed part, though not an essential part, of the Ordinal.\*

Parker could not hide from himself the fact, that the offer of the archbishopric would, in all probability, be made to him. He spoke on the subject to his friend Sir John Cheke, and wrote upon it again to Sir Nicolas Bacon. If their object was to benefit him, he repeated what he had said before, that his desire was a situation where he might enjoy literary leisure, and benefit the Church by his writings. If they took higher ground, a younger man was necessary to discharge duties so arduous as those which would be imposed upon the archbishop by the circumstances of the times. He told Bacon, that the government should look out for a man in the vigour of his faculties; not faint-hearted, for he would have to encounter a bitter opposition; a man of fortune, for he would have to maintain the dignity of his office, and to

\* Menard, in his notes on the Sacramentary of St. Gregory, declares that the mitre was not introduced until the tenth century. No mention, according to this writer, is made of it in the ancient Pontificals. Saussajus, in his *Panoplia Episcopalis*, lib. i., Joseph Vicecomes, *De App. Missæ*, cap. xxix., claim for it a more ancient date; but Maskel seems to concur in opinion with Menard.

exercise the virtue of hospitality with diminished means ; not an avaricious man, for such a one never wins his way to men's hearts.

It was so evident that Parker was in earnest in his desire to avoid the archbishopric, that the government, urged by his friends, made the offer of the see of Canterbury to two other divines ; if to the title of a divine Dr. Nicolas Wotton could lay claim.

The primacy was offered to Dr. Nicolas Wotton, the Dean of Canterbury ; and the offer is a further proof of the queen's disinclination to Protestantism, until she was compelled, as an act of state policy, to permit herself to be regarded as the Protestant queen. We here continue the distinction formerly made between a Protestant and a Reformer. Both Henry VIII. and Queen Elizabeth were Reformers ; but neither of them inclined to Lutheranism ; Elizabeth, moreover, had a special abhorrence of Calvinism. Such were precisely the principles of Nicolas Wotton. He declared, that the Church needed reformation in every department ; but this did not prevent him from serving as a statesman under both Henry and his son, under Queen Mary, and under Queen Elizabeth. Neither Henry nor Mary would have tolerated a Protestant, while, at the same time, Reginald Pole, though not a Protestant, professed to be a Reformer. Wotton had been in the privy council of the late sovereigns, and had filled important diplomatic stations. This was the kind of man that the queen would have liked to see at the head of the Church of England. But Wotton was aware, that more than administrative ability and knowledge of the world was, at this time, required in the primate. There were many important theological questions to be settled ; upon which a speedy decision would be demanded, owing to the resumption of the sittings of the Council of Trent.

CHAP.  
VIII.

Matthew  
Parker.

1559-75.

Primacy  
offered to  
Dr. Wot-  
ton, Dean  
of Canter-  
bury.

CHAP.  
VIII.Matthew  
Parker.

1559-75.

Primacy  
offered to  
Fecken-  
ham,  
Abbot of  
West-  
minster.

Wotton, though he held high ecclesiastical preferment, was not a theologian, and Cecil saw the wisdom of accepting his refusal of the primacy.\*

The next offer astonishes us more. The primacy was offered to Feckenham, Abbot of Westminster, or at all events it was so reported and believed. Feckenham was a popular character; for there were many Protestants who gratefully remembered that, in the reign of Mary, he always pleaded on the side of mercy. He had been chaplain to Bishop Bonner, and, as Fuller says, "he crossed the proverb, 'like master like man;' the patron being cruel and the chaplain kind to such as in judgment dissented from him." Feckenham had himself experienced persecution under Edward, and was preferred by Mary. After he was deposed, he was treated with much indulgence by the ministers of King Edward. From the beginning of Elizabeth's reign he had openly opposed the chief measures of her government; but the queen evidently thought it possible that, through the offer of preferment, he could be brought to terms. She was mistaken. He remained resolute not to accept the royal supremacy; and it is so unlikely that the Puritans would have tolerated such an archbishop, that we should probably be correct in saying, that he was only "talked of for the primacy."†

The failure of these negotiations brought that conviction to the queen's mind, at which her counsellors had

\* Holinshed, p. 1403; Walton's Life of Sir Henry Wotton; Wordsworth, Biog. v. 11. See also Forbes, p. 112, and Hayne's State Papers, p. 324.

† Wood's Athenæ, i. 500. The account of Feckenham in Wood is taken chiefly from Reyner's *Historia Benedictorum*. When Feckenham was abbot of Westminster he planted the elms where they still stand in Dean's Yard.

already arrived, that, if her throne was to stand, she must make common cause with the Protestants. The queen would have preferred a Papist with reforming tendencies ; but she was prepared to accept a Protestant with Catholic principles the more readily, when Dr. Parker, who had been her friend from childhood, and had lately been her adviser, was the person selected.

CHAP.  
VIII.

Matthew  
Parker.

1559-75.

Parker remained unwilling to incur the responsibilities of the primacy. He had, however, become less reluctant to yield to the wishes of his friends, when he found that the choice lay between himself and such men as Wotton and Feckenham, both excellent persons, but certainly not the functionaries required by the exigences of the age.

On the 17th of May it was notified to Parker, by Lord Keeper Bacon, that it had been determined by the queen in council, that he should become Archbishop of Canterbury and primate of all England. Bacon wrote in terms complimentary as well as friendly : “if I knew a man,” he said, “to whom the description made in the beginning of your letter might more justly be referred than to yourself, I would prefer him before you ; but knowing none so meet, indeed, I take it to be my duty to prefer you before all others, and the rather also because, otherwise, I should not follow the advice of your own letter. The rest, which is much, I defer till our next meeting. It is like that, or it be long, you shall receive letters subscribed by me and others jointly.” \*

On the 19th of May, the threatened mandate arrived, curt and decided :—“after our hearty commendations, these be to signify unto you, that, for certain causes, wherein the queen’s majesty intendeth to use your service, her pleasure is, that you repair up hither with such speed as you conveniently may, and at your coming up you

Parker  
nominated  
primate.

\* Corresp. p. 63.



CHAP.  
VIII.Matthew  
Parker.

1559-75.

shall understand the rest." The letter was signed "your loving friends, N. Bacon, W. Cecill." It was addressed "To the right worshipful and our very friend Mr. Doctor Parker. Give these with speed." \*

Whether this letter miscarried, or whether Parker still hesitated as to the course to be pursued, no answer was returned; and, on the 29th of May, another despatch arrived, in which surprise is expressed at the non-arrival of an answer to the preceding summons; and a peremptory order given, that Dr. Parker should repair without delay to the court.

Parker's  
letter to  
the queen.  
June, 1559.

Parker determined to address the queen herself. His friends had been zealous for his promotion, and had placed his character before her majesty in too favourable a light. He desired, that the queen should exercise her own judgment upon the subject. A man was required for the primacy of more wit, learning, virtue, and experience than himself. He attributed her majesty's favourable estimate of his character, to the fact of his having been chaplain to the queen's mother. This circumstance had constrained him to be the queen's bedesman through life; and this only led him to regret the more his inability, "inwardly in knowledge, and outwardly in extern sufficiencies, to do her grace any meet service," or such as would be answerable to the expectation of him which she had formed.†

The object of the letter evidently was that, in any future misunderstandings—and, in dealing with such a person as Elizabeth, they could not be avoided—he might have it in his power to remind the queen, that the primacy had not been sought by him; that it was forced upon him by her grace; and that, if she should complain of his incompetence, the blame would rest, not with him, but with her. He did not expect any longer to be able to

decline the post; and therefore, after taking this precaution, he gracefully concludes by referring himself wholly to her grace's pleasure, rather than by just allegation of his unworthiness, the loyal duty of his faithful heart should, in any way, be suspected.\*

CHAP.  
VIII.

Matthew  
Parker.  
1559-75.

The only notice taken of this appeal to her majesty, and probably the only answer expected, was an official summons to the court, accompanied by the following kind letter from the lord keeper, which was intended to be jocose, and was really quaint:—

Parker  
again sum-  
moned to  
court.

“The former resolution concerning you is now confirmed by a second, and if you be not already sent for to come hither, it will not be long or you shall. I meant, before I understood thus much, to have had you this night at supper at my house, for the matter of your letters delivered to me by one that sued for a *ne exeat regnum*, which at my return to London he shall have; but being countermanded by the queen, I must intreat you to take pain with my wife to pass away a shrewd supper. Written in haste from the court by your assuredly, N. BACON.”†

Parker now prepared in earnest to yield to the solicitations of his friends and the commands of the queen. As often happens in such cases, when he girded on his armour, and went forth into the battlefield, he found the difficulties fewer and his own powers greater than, by his timidity or his modesty, he had been led to expect or to fear. He rose to his position.

On the 18th of July a *congé d'élire* was issued to the Dean and Chapter of Canterbury in the following form:

*Congé  
d'élire.*  
July 18,  
1559.

“The Queen to her beloved in Christ, the Dean and Chapter of the Metropolitan Church of Canterbury, greeting: On your part a humble supplication has been made to us, that whereas

\* Corresp. p. 70.

† Ibid. p. 71.

CHAP.  
VIII.

Matthew  
Parker.

1559-75.

the aforesaid church, by the natural death of the most reverend father and lord in Christ, the Lord Reginald Pole, cardinal, the last archbishop thereof, is now vacant and destitute of the solace of a pastor, we would be graciously pleased to grant to you our fundatorial licence to elect another archbishop and pastor, We, favourably inclined to your prayers in this matter, have thought fit to grant you this licence, requiring that you may elect such a person archbishop and pastor who may be devoted to God and useful and faithful to us and our kingdom. In testimony of which thing, &c. Witness the Queen at Westminster, on the 18th day of July, 1559.”\*

Whether a letter missive was addressed on this occasion to the dean and chapter in the queen's name is doubtful; but the dean and chapter were perfectly aware that it was intended, that they should elect Dr. Parker; and they were careful to observe the ancient precedents of the Church of England. It was reported that, proceeding “according to the ancient manner and laudable custom of the aforesaid church, anciently used and inviolably observed,” they elected Matthew Parker, D.D., for their bishop on the 1st of August, 1559.

Election.  
August 1,  
1559.

The archbishop elect was immediately involved in a multiplicity of business. Before taking possession of the see, he wished to have settled some questions relating to the temporalities of the Church; which, in the confusion of the time and the unprincipled avarice both of the sovereign and of her courtiers, had become complicated and endangered.

It was not till the 9th of September, that he heard again from the lord keeper, who had been diligently labouring in his friend's behalf. Bacon sent to Parker, as he said, “the royal assent, sealed and delivered within two hours after the receipt thereof, wishing unto him as

\* Rolls, Patents 1 Eliz. p. 6. Fœdera, xv. 536.

good success therein as ever happened to any that have received the like." He wrote from Redgrave, his country house ; and he displays a poetical turn of mind, when, in allusion to his enjoyment of a brief holiday, and an escape from the turmoils of the metropolis, he tells his friend : "It fares by me as it doth by a bird that hath scaped out of the cage, which tasting the sweets of liberty never returns unforced." \*

CHAP.  
VIII.

Matthew  
Parker.

1559-75.

The congratulations of the lord keeper were premature. Through the inadvertence of the official whose business it was to draw up the letters patent, the commission issued for the confirmation and consecration of the primate elect was found, through the omission of a sentence, to be insufficient for its object. The commission was addressed to six prelates : Cuthbert, Bishop of Durham ; Gilbert, Bishop of Bath and Wells ; David, Bishop of Peterborough ; Anthony, Bishop of Llandaff ; William Barlow, Bishop ; and John Scory, Bishop. It stated, that whereas the archiepiscopal see of Canterbury was lately vacant by the death of the Lord Reginald Pole, a licence had been granted to the Dean and Chapter of Canterbury to elect another archbishop and pastor to the see aforesaid, and that their choice had fallen on Matthew Parker, as by their letters patent, sealed with their common seal, it was made evident and apparent. It went on to say, "We, accepting that election, have granted to the said election our royal assent and also favour, and this by the tenour of these presents we signify to you ; requiring, and strictly commanding you, by the faith and affection in which you are held by us, that you would effectually confirm the said Matthew Parker, elected to be archbishop and pastor as is before mentioned of the aforesaid cathedral and metropolitan church of Christ at Canterbury, and that

The first  
com-  
mission  
for the  
confirma-  
tion.

\* Corresp. p. 76.



CHAP.  
VIII.

Matthew  
Parker.

1559-75.

you would effectually confirm the aforesaid election, and consecrate the said Matthew Parker archbishop and pastor of the church aforesaid, and perform all such and singular other things which belong in this matter to your pastoral office, according to the form of the statutes in this behalf set forth and provided." This was issued by writ from the privy seal by order of the queen, who was at this time paying a visit to the lord keeper at Redgrave.\*

The inadvertence alluded to was this, that the clause—"or at least four of you," was omitted. It followed, therefore, that if one were absent, or if one refused to act, the rest could not proceed legally to confirm or to consecrate. It so happened, that of the persons named in the commission, three were either unwilling, or else from ill-health were unable, to act; but, being personal friends of the primate elect, and having generally agreed to the ecclesiastical reforms in the reign of Henry VIII., it was still hoped, that they would conform to the regulations of the present reign; and, notwithstanding the late acts of Parliament, the government was in no hurry to deprive them of their sees.†

\* Mason in his *Vindiciæ*, writes thus of the letters patent:—"These royal letters patent which we produce, are so publicly and openly passed in the face of the world, that it is utterly impossible for them to be forged or counterfeited; for, according to the statute made in the twenty-seventh year of King Henry VIII., in the first place, the king's highness signs the same with his own hand. Secondly, one of the king's clerks of his signet upon the right of the king's hand, puts the king's signet thereto, and subscribing the same with his own hand, transmits them to the lord keeper of the privy seal. Thirdly, one of the king's clerks of the privy seal affixes the privy seal thereto, and subscribing the same with his own hand, directs them to the lord high chancellor of England, or lord keeper of the great seal of England, who, at the sight of the privy seal, appends to them the great seal of England."

† It would seem that it was at first the intention to permit them

Whether the recusants were influenced by conscientious or by party motives, the result was the same, and another commission was prepared. When the draft of the commission was submitted to Cecil, it appeared to his acute mind, that the wording was not even then sufficiently precise to prevent other legal questions from arising relating to the temporalities of the Church ; and the primate elect, with his usual caution, submitted the draft of the proposed letters patent to the inspection of six eminent lawyers, to obtain from each an opinion. These precautions having been taken, other letters patent were granted by the queen on the 6th of December, having been unanimously approved by the lawyers who had been consulted. The letters patent ran thus :—

CHAP.  
VIII.

Matthew  
Parker.

1559-75.

The second  
commis-  
sion for the  
confirma-  
tion.

“Elizabeth, by the grace of God, of England, France, and Ireland, Queen, Defender of the Faith, &c., to the reverend fathers in Christ, Antony, Bishop of Llandaff; William Barlow, sometime Bishop of Bath, now elect of Chichester: John Scory, sometime Bishop of Chichester, now elect of Hereford; Miles Coverdale, sometime Bishop of Exeter; John, Suffragan of Bedford; John, Suffragan of Thetford; John Bale, Bishop of Ossory, greeting: Whereas the archiepiscopal see of Canterbury being lately vacant by the natural death of the Lord Reginald Pole, cardinal, last and immediate archbishop and pastor of the same, upon the humble petition of the dean and chapter of our cathedral, and metropolitan church of Christ at Canterbury, We, by our letters patent, have granted to the same, licence to elect for themselves another archbishop and pastor of the see aforesaid; and the said dean and chapter, by virtue of our aforesaid licence obtained, have elected for themselves

Letters  
patent.  
Decem-  
ber 6,  
1559.

to retain their sees for a longer time, but difficulties appear to have arisen, for Tunstall was deprived, or probably, we should say, resigned his see, on the 28th of September, 1559. The Bishops of Bath and Peterborough were deposed during the autumn. Knowing that they would be ultimately deposed, they probably expedited the act.

CHAP.  
VIII.

Matthew  
Parker.  
1559-75.

and the church aforesaid our beloved in Christ, Matthew Parker, D.D., as archbishop and pastor, as by their letters patent, sealed with the common seal, thereupon directed to us, is more fully evident and apparent. We, accepting that election, have granted to the said election our royal assent and also favour, and this by the tenour of these presents we signify to you: requiring and strictly commanding you, by the faith and affection in which you are held by us, that you, or *at least four of you*, would effectually confirm the said Matthew Parker elected to be archbishop and pastor, as before mentioned, of the aforesaid cathedral and metropolitan church of Christ at Canterbury, and would effectually confirm the aforesaid election, and consecrate the said Matthew Parker archbishop and pastor of the church aforesaid, and perform and execute all and singular other things which belong in this matter to your pastoral office, according to the form of the statutes in this behalf set forth and provided, supplying nevertheless by our supreme royal authority of our mere motion and certain knowledge, whatever either in the things to be done by you pursuant to our aforesaid mandates, or in you, or any of you, your condition, state, or power, for the performance of the premisses, may or shall be wanting of those things which, either by the statutes of this realm, or by the ecclesiastical laws are required or are necessary on this behalf, the state of the times and the exigency of affairs rendering it necessary. In witness whereof we have caused these our letters to be made patent. Witness ourselves at Westminster, the 6th day of December, the second year of our reign."

Four  
bishops  
to officiate  
at the con-  
secration  
of a me-  
tropolitan.

On this mandate we may observe that, although a consecration by three bishops would have been correct, according to the principles of the universal Church, the ministration, nevertheless, of four functionaries at least was required by an Act passed in the reign of Henry VIII. for the consecration of an English primate. If, under the circumstances, a consecration had taken place, it would have been a valid consecration, canonical, but not legal.

The person consecrated would not have ceased to be a bishop ; but the *legality* of the act might have been questioned in the temporal courts, and the bishops consecrating might have been subjected to legal penalties. We may also remark, that “ the *supplentes* ” clause, or the supplying by the queen’s authority what might be lacking in the commission, refers to possible legal defects, and to these only. The court of Rome, as Archbishop Bramhall and Mr. Haddan clearly prove, in suchlike interests, has generally such dispensation clauses for “ more abundant caution.”

CHAP.  
VIII.

Matthew  
Parker.

1559-75.

Immediately consequent upon this commission, Bishop Barlow directed a citation to be published to all opposers ; calling upon them to declare any canonical objection, if any such objection could be raised. It commences thus, “ William, sometime Bishop of Bath and Wells, to all and singular the subjects of our lady the queen, wheresoever they be throughout the whole kingdom of England, greeting.” He then proceeds, in the legal verbiage of which we have already had a specimen, and with which, in all public documents, we are still familiar, to repeat what was said in the royal mandate :—

Citation by  
the com-  
missioners.

“ That the see of Canterbury having become vacant by the natural death of the Lord Reginald Cardinal Pole, last and immediate archbishop thereof, and the dean and chapter, acting under the royal licence, having duly elected the Reverend Matthew Parker, D.D., to be their archbishop, the queen had given her royal assent to the said election of the person elected ; had signified to him and his associates, by her royal letters patent under the great seal of England, her commands to confirm the person elected and the aforesaid election, and to consecrate the said Matthew, Archbishop of Canterbury, with all convenient speed.”

He straightway affirms the willingness of the commissioners to obey the royal mandate ; and they forthwith



CHAP.  
VIII.Matthew  
Parker.

1559-75.

decreed that all and singular opposers, if such there were, who wished to speak against or oppose the said election, the form thereof, or the person elected, should be "cited and summoned to appear in the parish church of St. Mary-le-Bow, in the city of London, but within the immediate jurisdiction of the Church of Christ, Canterbury, on the Saturday following, viz. the 9th day of December, between the hours of eight and nine in the forenoon of the same day, with continuation and prorogation of days then following if need should so require, to speak, except, propose, and do, and further to receive what justice should require in the matter, and the quality and nature of the said business demand and require of them."

To this document the seal of the Dean and Chapter of Canterbury was affixed. It bore date at London, the 6th day of December. Thomas Willet, notary public, made affidavit, and certified to the said Lord William, sometime Bishop of Bath and Wells, that on the 7th day of the month, he had executed the mandate aforesaid in the church of St. Mary-le-Bow.\*

Confir-  
mation.  
Dec. 9,  
1559.

On the 9th of December, between the hours of eight and nine, the lords commissioners took their seats in Bow Church. Before them appeared in person John Incent, notary public, and presented the royal letters commissary patent, which have just been laid before the reader. He humbly supplicated the lords commissioners to proceed to the business of the confirmation. The commissioners desired the document to be read; and immediately signified their readiness, in obedience to the royal mandate, to proceed according to the force, form, and effect thereof. Incent exhibited his proxy for the

\* There are obvious reasons why certain processes, which in ordinary cases may be taken for granted, should be particularized when we are noticing the consecration of Parker.

Dean and Chapter of Canterbury, and made himself a party for them. In the procuratorial name of the Dean and Chapter, he presented to the commissioners the worshipful Nicholas Bullingham, doctor of laws, who exhibited his proxy for the worshipful and illustrious Matthew Parker, elect of Canterbury, and made himself a party for the same. Incent then exhibited the original citatorial mandate, together with a certificate endorsed with the execution thereof; and prayed all and singular persons cited to be publicly preconized. A public preconization having been made three several times, of all and singular opposers, at the doors of Bow Church, and no one appearing or opposing, the notary public accused of contumacy all opposers who refused to appear when summoned; and he prayed that each of them should be reputed contumacious, and in pain of such their contumacy, be precluded the means of further opposing in this matter the said election, form, or person elected. The lords commissioners pronounced them contumacious, and granted the prayer of the petition. Incent then exhibited the process of election, which was inspected and examined by the lords commissioners, who willed and decreed that the process should be taken and considered as read. Witnesses having been called and examined in confirmation of the attestations of Incent, and certain other forms having been gone through, the commissioners confirmed the election, and decreed that the said most reverend lord, now elected and confirmed, should be consecrated and blessed. They further committed to the said lord elected and confirmed, the guardianship and administration of the spiritualities and temporalities of the said archbishopric of Canterbury. They also decreed him to be put into real, actual, and corporeal possession of the said archbishopric, and all rights, dignities, and honours pertaining and belonging to

CHAP.  
VIII.Matthew  
Parker.

1559-75

CHAP.  
VIII.

Matthew  
Parker.

1559-75.

it; they gave directions, that after his consecration he should be enthroned by the Dean and Chapter of Canterbury, and any other or ever to whom by right and custom that office is known to belong, according to the laudable custom at the church of Christ at Canterbury, neither objecting to, nor opposing the modern laws and statutes of this illustrious kingdom of England.\*

Form of  
confir-  
mation.

Such from time immemorial has been the form of confirming bishops in England; and such the form which still remains, varying merely in the necessary details. But we must remark, that in Queen Elizabeth's time the process was more than a mere form. Opposers in the sixteenth century would have been heard, if they had any objection to offer: whereas, in the nineteenth century, when opposers in a memorable case appeared, they were refused a hearing.

Parker  
archbishop  
elect.

Matthew Parker was now lord archbishop elect of Canterbury. Although he did not possess before his consecration the *potestas ordinis*, he could exercise so much of the *potestas jurisdictionis* as was, during the vacancy of the see, until his election, confided to the Dean and Chapter of Canterbury. Parker determined to put in force the powers he thus possessed, aided also as he was by the prerogatives of the crown, in order that some temporal affairs dependent upon the ecclesiastical state might be settled before his assumption of the full powers

\* The deed of confirmation from which the statements in the text are taken, still exists. It may be seen in Archbishop Parker's register, preserved with minute care, in the archiepiscopal library of Lambeth, and a facsimile of it is given in the splendid work of Mr. Bailey, to which reference has been so frequently made. The deed is of considerable size, on a sheet of vellum; the handwriting is the same as that which appears in Cranmer's register. So that the document we refer to is a contemporary document, and the initials A. H., which occasionally occur, prove the writer to be Anthony Huse, Cranmer's registrar.

of the primacy. Owing to the cessation of our intercourse with Rome, and our rejection of the papal supremacy, there were several legal matters which required to be adjusted; in the adjustment of which Parker did not wish to establish a precedent to be followed by future metropolitans. Certain points required to be settled, and to be settled once for all; but, being in an anomalous position, he desired to have some of his actions regarded as exceptional.

CHAP.  
VIII.  
Matthew  
Parker.  
1559-75.

Parker, lenient as he was to the Anglo-Catholics, was now convinced that he must compel them to separate from the extremes on their side of the Church—the papists; and he could listen to no further proposals on the part of the deposed diocesans. Out of the moderate men on both sides he formed a third party—a new man—and this party he distinguished by the name of Protestants, attaching thereto a new meaning.

The diocesans, after a time, perceived the mistake they had committed, and sought to regain their position; but Parker was firm. The attempt, on their part, was now simply for toleration; and the Emperor, together with those of the German princes who co-operated with him, and by whose advice the deposed diocesans had acted, addressed the queen in their favour. They urged her, if she deposed these diocesans, to permit them to officiate as “vacant bishops,” and to assign to them certain churches in the large towns.

Letter  
from the  
Emperor  
and Ger-  
man  
princes.

The queen's reply, under the advice of Parker, was consistent and dignified. A reference was first made to the past history of these prelates. They had subscribed to the royal supremacy in her father's reign, and why should they withhold their subscription now? Although their inconsistent obstinacy was causing disturbance and dissent, the queen was ready to treat them with consideration

The  
queen's  
reply.



CHAP.  
VIII.Matthew  
Parker.

1559-75.

and gentleness ; but she could not venture, by granting the Emperor's request, to give offence to the rest of her subjects. To grant to the recalcitrant prelates separate churches, and to permit them to keep up a distinct communion, were things which neither the public interest nor her own honour would permit. The request for such indulgence was, she said, unreasonable, "*for there was no new faith propagated in England ; no religion set up, but that which was commanded by our Saviour, practised by the primitive Church, and unanimously approved by the fathers of the best antiquity . . .* therefore, though out of her own clemency, and especially at the request of certain crowned heads, she was willing to connive a little, in order to reclaim these prelates to better temper, yet she was resolved not to be so kind as to feed their disease, and cherish their obstinacy."\*

Thus did the archbishop elect, through the advice given to the queen, proclaim the intention of the government to take the Protestant standpoint when acting against Papists. The queen and her advisers had an opportunity of showing their determination, on the other hand, to uphold Catholicism, as distinguished from Romanism, against the ultra-Protestants or Puritans ; for a petition was soon after addressed to the crown from the opposite extreme.

Petition of  
the Puri-  
tans to the

The  
queen's  
reply.

The Puritans persuaded their friends and supporters abroad, to urge the queen to give them full liberty to manage their own affairs. In her reply to them, the queen pointed out that they petitioned for nothing less than for permission to set at nought the canons of the Catholic Church, and the statutes of her realm. It was not consistent, she observed, with her interest and honour to allow diversity of practice.

\* Camden, p. 40. Collier, vi. 263.

In both these answers the tone and the spirit were admirable. But the queen's conduct was the more to be admired in her reply to the Puritans, because by them she had of late been grossly insulted. By both the Papists and the Puritans her government had been opposed; but hitherto she had met, for the most part, with courtesy and kindness from those of her subjects who contended for the papal supremacy. Up to this time it was by the Puritans that she had been personally insulted; and they attacked her with bad feeling and bad taste. A large number of the Puritans were under the influence of John Knox, who was attempting to form a party against both the queen and the Church of England. Not only had this fierce man sought to blast, by his maledictions, the government of females, advocating their destruction whenever the sceptre was wielded by woman's hand, but he had lately threatened "death and damnation to such as, either in their forehead or hand, bear the mark of the beast." And a portion of his mark, he said, "are all these dregs of papistry which are left in your great book of England (viz. the Book of Common Prayer), such as crossing in baptism, kneeling at the Lord's table, mumbling or singing of the Litany, '*a fulgure et tempestate*,' &c.: any one jot of which *diabolical inventions* will I never counsel any man to use. The whole order of your book appeareth rather to be devised for upholding of massing-priests than for any good instruction which the simple people can receive thereof. Your sacraments were ministered, for the most part, without the soul, and by those who to Christ Jesus are no true ministers, and God grant that so yet they be not," &c. &c.\*

CHAP.  
VIII.

Matthew  
Parker.

1559-75.

John Knox  
tries to  
form a  
party  
against the  
queen and  
the Church  
of Eng-  
land.

\* Collier, vi. 277. It is evident that John Knox had no reluctance to the unchurching of the Church of England. Parker's abhorrence of the man was often expressed.

CHAP.  
VIII.Matthew  
Parker.

1559-75.

Divisions  
among the  
Puritans.

The fact is, that the Puritans were already split into two parties; and the divergence continued to increase. The one party, to which the name of Puritans soon became exclusively attached, was devoted to the principles of the Calvinistic reformers, and as such was opposed to the continuance of the episcopate. The English reformers became aware, that this was giving up the whole question of the continuity of the Church. The question had come to this—shall we have the old Catholic Church reformed, or shall we establish a new Protestant sect? Among the returned exiles there were many who, although they were too much influenced by their foreign correspondents in points of doctrine, nevertheless saw clearly the advantage of adhering to the Church system. Both Parker and Cecil recognized the policy of conciliating these persons. They became aware, that large concessions would have to be made to their prejudices; but they would do for the Church the best they could by securing their conformity. They felt, that omissions might be supplied and corrections might be made by future legislation; and the very circumstances of their position would lead the majority of the conformists to right conclusions. The difficulties with which Parker, at this period of his life, had to contend, related to the amount of concessions which policy demanded, sometimes at an apparent relinquishment of principle. The conforming Puritans were violent on the subject of these concessions; but by degrees, as Parker expected, Church principles even among them gained the ascendancy.

Parker felt that it was very important, before entering upon his sacred office, to ascertain the real condition of the English Church; he determined therefore, by calling into action the royal prerogative, in conjunction with his authority as metropolitan elect, to appoint a lay com-

mission to report to the crown on the state of the Church. In doing this he certainly invested the commission with powers scarcely consistent with those principles of the Church, which he was labouring to uphold. But the case was exceptional and temporary, and he was not establishing a precedent. Neither he nor the queen objected to the exercise of despotic power, when the opposition they met with was organized by faction, not being the mere result of an unenlightened conscience. It was on this ground, we may presume, that he consented to the establishment of the Court of High Commission. The powers of this court were at first judiciously employed in upholding the laws of the state and the canons of the Church, when in a revolutionary age extraordinary power was required for these purposes; but the commission in the end, when it was enlarged and fully organized, became as tyrannical in practice as it was unsound in principle.

CHAP.  
VIII.

Matthew  
Parker.

1559-75.

Establish-  
ment of the  
Court of  
High Com-  
mission.

The commissioners, though appointed by the queen, received their instructions from Parker. These instructions were embodied in certain injunctions drawn up by the archbishop elect, but enforced by royalty. In drawing them up, Parker called in the advice of Cecil, and by him the injunctions were carefully revised. The commissioners were to require wherever they went, and from all functionaries, a recognition of the royal supremacy. The Puritans were conciliated by a denunciation of a superstitious reverence for images, relics, and miracles; on which point the commissioners were to make minute inquiries. They were also to censure pilgrimages, the setting up of candles, and praying upon beads. For reasons before assigned, many of the clergy were unable to preach or write their own sermons: they were to be required to procure a sermon, each rector in his church, at least once a quarter: upon other Sundays, unless a

Injun-  
ctions given  
to the  
commis-  
sioners.



CHAP.  
VIII.  
Matthew  
Parker.  
1559-75.

licensed preacher could be procured, a homily was to be read. Every parish was required to procure a Bible, of the largest volume, in English, together with the paraphrases, also in English, of Erasmus. The policy of thus authorizing the paraphrases of Erasmus is at once apparent. Parker's desire was, whilst sanctioning a deviation from practices which had been abused to superstition, and whilst requiring men to search the Scriptures, like the good Bereans, to see "whether these things be so," nevertheless, to make it apparent that in the interpretation of Scripture, his teaching was in accordance with that of a Catholic divine, who, though a friend of reform, had never been a Protestant.

Although an affectation of skill in singing was not to be carried too far, still the Common Prayer was to be distinctly sung. Choirs were to be kept up, and lands dedicated for their support were to be secured to the church, while, for the satisfaction of those who had a taste for sacred music, an anthem was to be allowed. During the performance of Divine Service all the customary marks of reverence were to be strictly observed. The Litany was to be sung, and the people, when repeating the responses, were required devoutly and humbly to kneel upon their knees; and whensoever the name of Jesus was pronounced, either in a sermon or in the offices of the Church, due reverence was to be made by all persons, young and old, "with lowness of courtesy, and uncovering of heads of the men kind." \* Registers

\* See Collier, vi. 256. Strype and Cardwell seem to think that the injunctions were drawn up by the commission of divines which sat in Canon Row. It is more than doubtful, however, whether they, as a body, would have given their assent to all the injunctions. We may with more confidence attribute them to Parker and Cecil; the latter we know revised them.

of weddings, christenings, and burials, as enjoined in the reign of Henry VIII., were to be carefully kept.

The commissioners were empowered, upon examination, to annul spiritual promotions, if they had not been legally made; and to call for an exhibition of letters of orders—a power still retained by churchwardens. Although these powers were ample, there was no desire to see them applied to the purposes of persecution; they were permitted to discharge persons who had been committed to prison for their religion, and to restore such as had been illegally displaced. They were to allow pensions to those who, refusing the oath of supremacy, determined to quit their livings—these were wise and merciful provisions, which ought to be recorded to the credit of Elizabeth and her advisers: and the wisdom of the regulations was apparent in the fact, that very few of the benefited clergy refused to conform. The principle of Parker and Cecil was not to oust the Catholics; but to compel the Catholics, being in possession, to tolerate Protestants.

The report of the commission was on the whole satisfactory; the temper, if not the learning, of the clergy being such as was desired. It was reported, that the commissioners found both clergy and laity “eager for the abolition of foreign jurisdiction, both in spiritual matters and in temporal.” The general feeling was in favour of the restoration of the crown of England to its rightful supremacy, and to the administration of the Sacraments and Order of Divine Service as set forth in the Book of Common Prayer.\*

There exists among the MSS. of the palace of Lambeth a scroll of parchment containing a long list of the clergy who subscribed to this statement in some of the dioceses. and this may be regarded as a sample of the whole. It

CHAP.  
VIII.

Matthew  
Parker.

1559-75.

Report of  
the com-  
mission.

\* Strype's Annals, I. i. 255.

CHAP.  
VIII.

Matthew  
Parker.

1559-75.

is not to be supposed, of course, that all who subscribed did so with the same goodwill; motives are at all times varied and mixed; but the fact was now made known to Parker, that in many places, where he had not expected support, he would not meet with opposition. From the deprived diocesans he no longer had to fear an effective opposition. Many of them he respected and loved for their piety and virtue, and he retained their friendship till the hour of their death; nevertheless he had become aware, that the regulars withholding their support, he must depend for learning, zeal, and piety upon the Protestants.

Parker was now preparing for his consecration. It is customary for the bishop elect, with the consent of the metropolitan, to make choice of the prelates to officiate at his consecration. In the present case, the primacy being vacant, there were exceptional difficulties to be encountered and overcome. By the cautious mind of Parker, every step to be taken was carefully considered, and, whenever it was necessary, legal advice was obtained. He felt that, while, on the one hand, he must be particular in following precedent, from the peculiar circumstances of the Church of England, and her repudiation of papal authority, he would, to a certain extent, be establishing a precedent.

It might have saved some controversy, although it would have prevented much profitable investigation, if historians had always borne in mind, that what may be necessary to render a consecration legal—that is, in accordance with the laws of a nation—may not, when regarded from only an ecclesiastical point of view, be absolutely necessary to render a consecration valid. We have already remarked, but must here repeat, that in the case of Parker, his consecration would not have been legal, *i.e.* it would not have been in accordance with the

enactments of the English Parliament, if he had been consecrated by only three bishops, because the English law, in its carefulness to preserve the apostolical succession, has determined, by way of extra precaution, that while, for the consecration of a bishop, three prelates in episcopal orders, the metropolitan being one, must officiate, not fewer than four must co-operate in the consecration of a metropolitan himself.\* In any country in which such a law is not in force, the consecration of a metropolitan by only three bishops would of course be valid, and, in the absence of any law upon the subject, not illegal. A consecration conducted by only one bishop, though contrary to the canons of the universal Church, which require the administration of this holy ordinance by three bishops at least, would be regarded as irregular, and uncanonical, but not invalid. The reason why three bishops are required to officiate, is to prevent clandestine consecrations; and, in the old Roman law, "*tres faciunt collegium.*" It was ordered therefore, in future times, that consecrations should be performed by a college of bishops.†

CHAP.  
VIII.

Matthew  
Parker.

1559-75.

Consecra-  
tion by one  
bishop  
valid.

\* The statute 25 Henry VIII. requires the presence of the metropolitan and two bishops; or, without the metropolitan, four bishops.

† The reader who would investigate this subject is referred to Bingham, lib. ii. cap. xi. § 6. This learned writer establishes the fact, that the consecration of a bishop by only one bishop was regarded valid, if proof were brought before the church that the consecration took place with the essential ceremonies; although, to prevent scandal, they would prohibit such a bishop from officiating until he had obtained a special licence from the primate of his church. Bingham also proves that the Bishop of Rome had no more privilege in this respect than any other prelate. See also Con. Arelatensis, Can. i. et ii.; Catalani Commentarius, tom. i. tit. xiii. 289-383; Bellarmine, De Notis Ecclesiæ, cap. viii.; and Vasquez, In Disputationibus, pars iii. cxlviii. cap. vii. These are spoken of "as co-operators, or assistant consecrators, in the ancient canons, and, together with the chief bishop, they convey the episcopal character." For the practice of the Western



CHAP.  
VIII.Matthew  
Parker.  
1559-75.

Although among the bishops contemporary with Parker, there could be no doubt as to the validity of their orders, and of their having become, through their respective consecrations, bishops of the Catholic Church, there were several whose right to act, as diocesans in the Church of England, might be disputed. Some there were who had been unlawfully deprived of their sees, and others who were never at any time called to preside over a diocese. They might, as bishops of the Catholic Church, discharge their episcopal functions, consecrate, ordain, confirm, and administer the sacraments in any part of the world; but they may have had no diocesan jurisdiction assigned to them; and they might be subjected to legal penalties for officiating in a diocese without the permission of the diocesan. They may have conferred the grace, but, under the peculiar circumstances in which they stood, they might have been punished for doing so.

Vacant  
bishops.

The episcopate in England at this time consisted, to a great extent, of what are technically called "vacant bishops," or, as they were styled in the Greek Church, *ἐπίσκοποι σχολάζοντες*,—bishops who had resigned their sees, or who had been unlawfully deprived of them, some by King Edward, others by Queen Mary; or who had never been in possession of a see, as was the case, and is still the case, with suffragan bishops.

Suffragan  
bishops.

We ourselves live at a time when the primitive system

Church it will be enough to refer to Sir William Palmer's Essay, i. 372. The authority for "vacant bishops" to officiate in the church is shown by Balsamon and Zonaras on the eighteenth canon of Antioch. Thomassin (*Eccles. Disc.*) describes their origin and details their duties. It is sometimes said that the Bishop of Rome, among his infringements of the canons and canon law of the Church, claims to consecrate without assistance. But this may be doubted. A consecration by the pope in the Middle Ages was very rare. Consecrations in the Curia were usually performed by the Bishop of Ostia, other cardinals assisting.

has been partially revived, of having suffragan bishops to assist diocesan bishops.\* The title of suffragan in this connection is an unfortunate one, because it leads to a confusion of ideas. All the bishops of a province are the suffragans, and are so called, of the archbishop. In the Romish Church, a nominal diocese, *in partibus infidelium*, is sometimes assigned to these "vacant bishops," the only bishops the *Romish dissenters* had in England until the time of Dr. Wiseman, who was himself consecrated to a see he never saw, and of which few persons had ever heard. There are also now, as in Parker's time, many prelates who, like Bishop Maltby, Bishop Blomfield, and Bishop Sumner, incapacitated by illness or old age, have retired from diocesan duties, although they still retain all the powers and prerogatives of the episcopate. Those *ἐπίσκοποι σχολάζοντες* who have retired from diocesan duties in the colonies, still exercise their episcopal functions; and are often employed in rendering assistance to their brethren whose dioceses in the mother country have become so large that, without such assistance, they could not adequately discharge the episcopal functions, beyond that of general superintendence.†

CHAP.  
VIII.  
Matthew  
Parker.  
1559-75.

It should be borne in mind that bishops were in existence before dioceses were established. The boundaries of dioceses were limits of convenience for the preservation of order in peaceful times. The powers that a man possessed as a bishop were, for the con-

Episcopal  
jurisdiction over a  
particular  
see, one  
thing;  
episcopal  
authority,  
another  
thing.

\* For our permission to exercise this undoubted right of the Church, we are indebted to the wisdom and piety of the present prime minister, Mr. Gladstone.

† For an account of the *ἐπίσκοποι σχολάζοντες*, see Suicer, 1204, and also 1178. Useful as Suicer is, he is not to be compared to our Bingham, and to the latter we may refer, i. 140. The student of theology cannot begin his studies more profitably than by devoting his attention to Bingham, verifying, as far as can be, his authorities.

CHAP.  
VIII.Matthew  
Parker.

1559-75.

venience of the Church, to be exercised under such regulations as the Church, in the aggregate or in its branches, might see fit to make. Without questioning the validity of his act, a prelate, if he were intentionally to violate the canons enacted by the universal or by a provincial Church, would, without any denial of his orders, be subjected to ecclesiastical punishment. We may understand this more clearly by reference to the ministrations of the second order in the sacred ministry. If a priest were to administer the Holy Communion to a sick person in another man's parish, *factum valet*, so far as the recipient of sacramental grace is concerned; but the officiating priest, having violated a law of the Church, might be subjected to a fine or to censure. In like manner, if a bishop were to confirm without permission, in the diocese of another prelate, he might by the metropolitan be called to account. In order, therefore, to enforce the necessary discipline among men who, so far as their orders are concerned, are equal, in every provincial or national Church one of the prelates is vested with the powers of primacy, to protect the Church from confusion. The canonists are only carrying out this principle when, having insisted on canonical regulations, they remind us, that these regulations do not interfere with that superintendence of the whole Catholic Church, in which each bishop has an equal share, not as to what concerns external polity and government, but as to what relates to the prime essential part of religion—the preservation, in its purity, of the Christian faith. “Whenever,” says Bingham, “the faith was in danger of being subverted by heresy, or destroyed by persecution, then [in the primitive Church, to which Parker looked for his precedents] every bishop thought it part of his duty and office [as opportunity occurred] to put to his helping

hand, and labour as much for any other diocese as for his own [if a diocese he had].” \*

CHAP.  
VIII.

Matthew  
Parker.

1559-75.

A bishop's power, including the power of ordination, the *potestas ordinis*, is one thing; the authority of a diocesan, or the *potestas jurisdictionis*, is another thing. The diocesan powers are conferred to prevent the ordinary episcopal power from being so exercised as to cause a schism. In like manner a prisoner of war on parole may walk where he pleases, if the question be simply as to his power of walking; but if he walks beyond a certain given point, his captors have a right to punish him as a perjured person. When a diocesan refused to exercise the powers divinely conferred upon him for the good of the people, then also, according to primitive practice, another bishop might interfere. For the better understanding of the practice of the primitive Church on this point, Bingham refers us to a few particular instances. It was a rule in the primitive Church, that no bishop should ordain in the diocese of another without his permission. Although this was a limitation of the episcopal power to a single diocese, yet, for the sake of order, it was canonically enforced and generally observed. But it might happen that a diocesan would become a heretic, and would ordain none but heretical clergy, persecuting the orthodox and driving them away. In that case it was noted, that any Catholic bishop, as being a bishop of the Church universal, was in such diocese authorized to ordain orthodox men. It was in one sense contrary to rule; but then it was in accordance with the supreme rule of all—the preservation of the faith. When the Church was in danger of being overrun with Arianism,

\* The testimony of St. Augustine, of Cyprian, of Gregory Nazianzen, of St. Basil, St. Chrysostom and others, with their corresponding conduct, may be seen, quoted or described, in Bingham, ii. cap. 5, § 1.



CHAP.  
VIII.

Matthew  
Parker.  
1559-75.

the great Athanasius, on his return from exile, did not hesitate, in the several cities through which he passed, to ordain presbyters,\* although those cities were not under his jurisdiction. The celebrated Eusebius of Samosata acted precisely in the same manner in the time of the Arian persecution under Valens.† Although in peaceful times he officiated in the episcopal vestments, yet now, according to Theodoret, he went about Syria, Phœnicia, and Palestine in a soldier's habit, ordaining presbyters and deacons, and setting in order the things he found wanting in the churches. Thus arrayed, he consecrated bishops also in Syria, Cilicia, and other places, whose names Theodoret has recorded. All this was contrary to strict rule; but was not in violation of the principles of the Church, when to the strict rule the necessities of the Church demanded an exception to be made. The Church might suspend a regulation made for the sake of order, but it could not exist without a clergy who could prove, through apostolical succession, their right to act as ambassadors from God to man. In a similar case, Epiphanius‡ exercised the same power, and asserted the like privilege. Having ordained Paulianus, first a deacon and then a presbyter, in a diocese of which he was not the diocesan, he was reproached for having acted contrary to the canon, and he vindicated his conduct on the principle now advanced, viz. that in cases of pressing necessity, when the interest of the Church was concerned, every bishop had authority to exercise, when required, the *potestas ordinis* conferred upon him at his consecration.

To meet the various controversies started from opposite quarters, relating to Parker's consecration, I have considered it expedient to refer occasionally to these facts,

\* Socrates, ii. cap. 24.

† Theodoret, iv. 13.

‡ Epiphan. Ep. ad Johan.

well known as they must be to the student of ecclesiastical history. Several suggestions must have been presented to Parker's mind, when, watched from two opposite quarters, he was considering how he could best maintain, under circumstances of peculiar difficulty, the Catholic and primitive principles to which he professed a loyal adherence. But to any extreme measures he had no occasion to resort: he had only to follow precedent, except where precedent, of a comparatively modern establishment, recognized the papal usurpation. He had to reject the tiara and to give its due weight to the crown, and then all was easy; he passed at once from medieval corruption to primitive orthodoxy.

CHAP.  
VIII.  
Matthew  
Parker.  
1559-75.

A majority of the sees were vacant. The vacancies had been occasioned in several instances, as we have seen, by the deaths of the incumbents.\* That the bishops who were deposed for not taking the oath of supremacy, were legally deposed on principles admitted by the Church,† Parker entertained no doubt. There were at

Vacancies  
in the sees.

\* Although it is said by Hecker, that "the sweating sickness had vanished from the earth in 1551," the country was certainly long after in a very unhealthy state. At the time of Mary's death there was undoubtedly some fearful epidemic prevailing, which was not extinct in 1560, if we may judge from the cautions drawn up by Cecil for Queen Elizabeth's apparel and diet. Among other things, he suggests that she admit of no perfume on her apparel or gloves, and that she take advice of her physicians for receiving twice every week "some preservative *contra pestem et venena*." See Haynes's State Papers, p. 368.

† Innumerable instances, says Sir William Palmer, occur in the history of the primitive Church, in which schismatical, heretical, and intruding bishops were expelled by the temporal power. Thus, the Emperor Gratian made a law expelling the Arian prelates, and restoring the orthodox to their sees.—Theodoret, v. 2. The usurper Theodosius and Peter the Fuller were expelled from the see of Jerusalem and Antioch respectively by the Emperors. See other instances in Episcopacy Vindicated.

CHAP.  
VIII.Matthew  
Parker.

1559-75.

this time seven bishops in England who favoured the Reformation. There were ten who were opposed to it,\* but the number of the Reformation prelates was increased by the Irish bishops, of whose services, since they acceded to the Reformation, Parker might have availed himself. He had, therefore, a sufficient choice, and it was his wish at first to have each branch of the Church in the queen's dominions represented—English, Irish, and Welsh.†

William  
Barlow,  
Bishop-  
elect of  
Chiches-  
ter, chosen  
to preside  
at Parker's  
consecra-  
tion.

After due consideration he selected the late Bishop of Bath and Wells, now about to be translated to Chichester, to preside at his consecration, and to take that part in the ceremonial which, under ordinary circumstances, would have devolved upon the metropolitan.

Parker was not above the consideration of worldly influences, and in selecting Bishop Barlow, at a time when the courtiers were doing what in them lay to bring the clergy into contempt, he made choice of a man who held a high position in society. Bishop Barlow was a privy councillor, and had been eminent as a statesman and diplomatist; having been employed in the reigns of Henry VIII., of Queen Mary, of Edward VI., and of Queen Elizabeth, in affairs of great importance.

Of Barlow's early history we know but little. Of Welsh extraction, he was born in Essex. He received his primary education at St. Osyth's, a monastery in his

\* Parker had ample precedent for his proceedings, several of his predecessors having been consecrated by their suffragans, as was the case with his immediate predecessors, Pole and Cranmer.

† Seven bishops, including Bale, Bishop of Ossory, were named in the second commission for Parker's consecration. Omitting the Bishop of Ossory, who did not obey the summons, or was prevented from coming by Parker, and adding the name of the Bishop of Sodor and Man, who, like the Bishop of Llandaff, Dr. Kitchin, conformed, there remained seven bishops who acquiesced in the Elizabethan reformation. See Haddan, p. 222.

native county, and completed it at the University of Oxford, where he became a Doctor of Divinity. Returning to Essex, he became a canon regular at St. Osyth's, and held various official appointments in connection with that house, until we find him, in 1527, prior of Bisham in Berkshire.

CHAP.  
VIII.

Matthew  
Parker.  
1559-75.

He declared himself on the side of the Reformation in the reign of Henry VIII. ; and when Crumwell had determined on the dissolution of the monasteries, that minister found an able, zealous, and generous supporter in Barlow, who not only resigned his own monastery, but procured several abbots and priors, his neighbours, to follow his example. A man so energetic in action, and possessing the important talent of being able to influence other men, was not likely to be neglected by Crumwell ; and when, through his instrumentality, Barlow was introduced at court, he soon commended himself to the notice of the king. He was sent by King Henry, early in 1536, with Lord Robert Howard into Scotland as ambassador, and from a letter now before me, sent to Crumwell, we learn that the object of his mission was to amend, if possible, "the disordered state of the border." In a letter from Henry VIII. to James V., the king speaks of Barlow as his "well-beloved counsellor, Wm. Barlow, sufficiently instructed in the specialities of certain weighty cases."

His favour  
with  
Crumwell.

The reader of these volumes will remember, that it was by the bestowal of ecclesiastical preferments that lawyers sought to remunerate their servants, and the system was not yet superseded. Accordingly, Barlow's remuneration came in the shape of a nomination to the see of Saint Asaph. He was elected Bishop of Saint Asaph by authority of a *congé d'élire*, dated the 7th of January, 1535-6.\*

Barlow is  
elected  
Bishop of  
Saint  
Asaph.  
Jan. 1536.

\* Bramhall, Pref. Fœdera, xiv. 558. There is an account of Barlow in Wood's Athenæ. Several letters *from* him and *to* him are



CHAP.  
VIII.

Matthew  
Parker.  
1559-75.

Elected  
and con-  
secrated  
Bishop of  
Saint  
David's.  
1536.

Being at this time detained in Scotland by his diplomatic duties, he was necessarily confirmed by proxy on the 22nd or 23rd of February.\* While Barlow was still in Edinburgh he received intelligence of the death of Rawlins, Bishop of Saint David's, and he applied, or his friends for him, that he might be translated to the more lucrative bishopric. He was elected to Saint David's on the 10th of April, and the royal assent to the election was granted on the 25th of the same month.† On the 26th he was invested with the temporalities of the see.‡ He had evidently hastened from Scotland, in furtherance of his object, and on the 21st of April he was confirmed in person in Bow Church.

Immediately afterwards he resumed his secular duties, and he remained in Scotland till the month of June.§ On the 30th of June he took his seat in the House of Lords, and in the upper house of Convocation.

Translated  
to the see  
of Bath  
and Wells.  
1549.

On the 3rd of February, 1548-9, Barlow was translated to the see of Bath and Wells. Besides being eminent as a statesman, Bishop Barlow was respected by his brothers on the episcopal bench as a theologian and divine. Archbishop Cranmer complained of him as being too jocose, and apt to bring serious matters to the test of ridicule; but he could not have been a light-minded man who was consulted on the composition of one of the most important books of the age. Bishop Barlow was concerned in the

to be found in the State Papers, and others in the Suppression of the Monasteries, published by the Camden Society.

\* The archbishop's commission to confirm is dated the 22nd of February, and his certificate to the king of confirmation, the 23rd. The date of the confirmation itself is omitted.—Cranmer's Regist.

† Cranmer's Regist.

‡ Mason, iii. 10, § 2.

§ Owing to the loss of the registers the exact day of Barlow's consecration is not known. Professor Stubbs, whose authority few will be found to question, places it on the 11th of June.

authorship of The Godly and Pious Meditations of a Christian Man, which is commonly called the Bishops' Book. Moreover, in the translation of the Scriptures, he was considered so good a scholar, that to him the Church was indebted for a revision of the apocryphal Book of Wisdom.

CHAP.  
VIII.

Matthew  
Parker.  
1559-75.

On the accession of Queen Mary, Bishop Barlow gave proof of his sincerity by resigning his bishopric of Bath and Wells. Being a married prelate, he anticipated deprivation under the new law; and he thought it expedient not to involve himself in unnecessary difficulties by offering an unavailing opposition.\* He determined to quit the country, and availed himself of the facilities of self-exile offered at the beginning of Mary's reign, to persons who declined to conform to the ecclesiastical regulations then introduced.

Resigns his  
bishopric  
on the ac-  
cession of  
Queen  
Mary.

Barlow chose a residence in Germany, for he had no sympathy with Calvinism. By this circumstance he was commended to the notice of the queen and of Cecil, when, on the death of Mary, the exiles returned to their native land. Instead of seeking, however, a restoration to the bishopric of Bath and Wells, he sought for and obtained a translation to the see of Chichester.†

He is ap-  
pointed to  
the see of  
Chichester  
1559.

\* Dr. Lingard says he was thrown into prison, and sarcastically remarks that, "feeling no desire of the crown of martyrdom, he professed himself a sincere penitent, and resigned his bishopric." He gives no authority for this statement, and, judging from what we know of Barlow's history, we should doubt his expressing his penitence—if it is meant that he repented of the part he had taken as a bishop in the Reformation. Unless proof be adduced, we should even doubt the accuracy of the statement that he was imprisoned. The policy of Mary's government at the beginning of her reign was to try lenient measures before resorting to persecution.

† Eighty years after these events, it was discovered that in Cranmer's registers, through the carelessness of the registrar, several entries were omitted. The same fact is to be predicated, and for the same cause,

CHAP.  
VIII.Matthew  
Parker.  
1559-75.The three  
bishops  
who joined  
with Bar-  
low in  
consecrat-  
ing Parker.

Co-operating with Bishop Barlow, formerly Bishop of Bath and Wells, now elect of Chichester, were John Hodgkins, Suffragan Bishop of Bedford; Miles Coverdale, late Bishop of Exeter; and John Scory, Bishop elect of Hereford.

with respect to the registers of Archbishop Warham, the predecessor, and of Cardinal Pole, the successor, of Archbishop Cranmer. Cranmer's register is a collection of various parchment documents, different in kind, size, and character, all bound together long after the legal murder of the archbishop. They are in several respects imperfect—the very opposite in every respect to Parker's register. Out of the record of eleven translations in Cranmer's register, five are wanting. Of forty-five consecrations at which Cranmer presided, the records of no less than nine are not to be found. Of these nine which are wanting, there is no reference whatever of any kind to three. Five of them, of which Barlow's is one, have the records preserved up to the act of confirmation, the actual consecration being omitted, or taken for granted. The register of Saint David's has also been destroyed. Owing to the loss of the register, certain Roman controversialists have questioned the consecration of a bishop who occupied four sees in the Church of England, two before and two after the Reformation. The subject of Barlow's consecration has been carefully investigated by many men of learning, both Protestants and Papists. We may mention Courayer, Mason, Bramhall, Haddan, and Stubbs; but the case is most concisely and clearly stated by a Romanist, eminent as an historian, and one who, when there is a doubt on any question, is accustomed to give the benefit of the doubt to the Roman side. Dr. Lingard had a character to sustain or to lose, and he was justly indignant when, by fanatics of his own party, he was attacked and reviled for not falsifying facts when those facts supported conclusions to which Romanists were unwilling to submit. I prefer his statement, as that of a theological opponent, and although there are some expressions to which we must demur, as conveying insinuations of which we cannot admit the force, this very circumstance adds value to the document, for it shows that he would have taken the opposite side if it were possible to do so. The passage about to be quoted appears in a letter to the editor of the Birmingham (Roman) Catholic Magazine in the year 1834. He had been attacked for permitting himself to be misled by false and spurious documents with respect to the consecration of Barlow. As I shall have occasion to refer to the letter again, I shall

Hodgkins had been consecrated in St. Paul's Cathedral as Bishop of Bedford, by John Stokesley, Bishop of London, Robert Wharton, Bishop of St. Asaph, and John Hilsey, Bishop of Rochester. As in the case of Barlow,

CHAP.  
VIII.

Matthew  
Parker.

1559-75.

John  
Hodgkins,  
suffragan  
Bishop  
of Bedford.

in this note confine myself to his vindication of himself on this point. He demands of his accuser,—“Why, I will ask, are we to believe that of all the bishops who lived in the long reign of Henry VIII., Barlow alone held and exercised the episcopal office without episcopal consecration? He was elected, and his election was confirmed in conformity with the statute of the twenty-fifth of that reign. Why should we suppose that he was not consecrated in conformity with the same statute? Was Cranmer the man to incur the penalty of a præmunire without cause, or was Henry a prince to allow the law to be violated with impunity? The act had been passed in support of the king's supremacy, and to cut off all recourse to Rome. Most certainly the transgression of its provisions would have marked out Barlow and Cranmer as fautors of the papal authority, and have exposed them to the severest punishment.

“For ten years Barlow performed all the sacred duties, and exercised all the civil rights of a consecrated bishop. He took his seat in Parliament and in Convocation as lord bishop of St. David's. He was styled by Bishop Gardyner, ‘his brother of St. David's;’ he ordained priests; he was one of the officiating bishops at the consecration of Dr. Buckly. Yet we are now called upon to believe that he was no bishop, and consequently to believe that no one objected to his votes, though they were known (on the hypothesis) to be illegal; or to his ordinations, though they were known to be invalid; or to his performance of the episcopal functions, though it was well known that each such function was a sacrilege!

“But why are we to believe these impossible—these incredible suppositions? Is there any positive proof that he was no bishop? None in the world. All that can be said is, that we cannot find any positive register of his consecration. So neither can we of many others, particularly of Bishop Gardyner. Did any one call in question the consecration of those bishops on that account? Why should we doubt the consecration of Barlow, and not that of Gardyner? I fear the only reason is this—Gardyner did not consecrate Parker, and Barlow did.”

The whole argument is so concisely stated by the great Roman Catholic historian, that I have thought it due to the reader to afford him an opportunity of reading it. As to the fact whether Barlow were duly



CHAP.  
VIII.  
Matthew  
Parker.  
1559-75.

he was consecrated under the old form, in accordance with the rites of the Salisbury pontifical, ten years before any revised ordinal had been appointed. He assisted at the consecration of Thomas Thirlby, Bishop of Westminster, when Bishop Bonner presided, under commission from Archbishop Cranmer; again at the consecration of William Knight, Bishop of Bath and Wells, when Archbishop Heath, then Bishop of Rochester, officiated for Archbishop Cranmer; again at the consecration of Paul Bush, Bishop of Bristol; and yet again at the consecration of Henry Man, Bishop of Sodor and Man, and at that of Nicolas Ridley, Bishop of Rochester.\* Of the validity of Bishop Hodgkins' consecration there could not be, therefore, the possibility of a doubt.

consecrated or not, it is of less importance when we bear in mind that the episcopal character was conveyed by three other bishops also, of whose consecration a doubt was never raised. The Church requires more than one bishop to consecrate, for the very purpose of meeting the difficulty here supposed, and so clearly refuted by Dr. Lingard. The episcopal character is conveyed, not by the archbishop or the presiding bishop alone, the other three or four being present only as witnesses; they are all and each the channels of the grace then given, so that if it were that the chief consecrator were canonically disabled, each and all of the others, by joining in the act, would prevent the proceeding from being invalid. This is clearly asserted by a writer whose authority will be disputed by no one. Martene expressly says, "*Omnes qui adsunt episcopi non tantum testes sed etiam cooperatores esse, citra omnem dubitationis aleam asserendum est.*"—Martene, *De Antiq. Rit.* lib. I. pars. vi. cviii. In the case of Parker, it was remarked that all the bishops joined, not only in the laying-on of hands, but in the words of consecration, "Take the Holy Ghost," a practice not usual at the present time, because not considered necessary, the laying-on of hands with the archbishop being deemed sufficient. The bishops at Parker's consecration followed, perhaps, the mediæval custom, for in the Exeter pontifical the assistant bishops are directed, not only to lay their hands on the "electus," but each of them, with the presiding bishop to say, "*Accipe Spiritum Sanctum.*"

\* See Stubbs, who gives the authorities.

Miles Coverdale was consecrated Bishop of Exeter, and John Scory Bishop of Rochester, on the 30th of August, 1551, at Croydon, by Thomas Cranmer, Archbishop of Canterbury, Nicolas Ridley, Bishop of London, and John Hodgkins, of whom we have just spoken, Bishop of Bedford.

CHAP  
VIII.  
Matthew  
Parker.  
1559-75.  
Miles Co-  
verdale,  
late Bishop  
of Exeter.

Dr. Parker, in selecting his consecrators, evidently desired to have the pre-Reformation Church represented, while appointing, according to law, that the revised ordinal should, now and henceforth, be the formulary adopted in the English Church.

John Scory,  
Bishop  
elect of  
Hereford.

The eventful day approached, and, as we should expect, every detail was carefully regulated under Parker's eye. It was determined that the consecration should take place in the chapel of Lambeth House. The Prior and Convent, as afterwards did the Dean and Chapter, of Canterbury, had always claimed it as a right that the episcopal consecrations in the province of Canterbury should take place in their cathedral, and that consequently, if consecrations were to take place elsewhere, it would be under a dispensation granted by them. But in looking over the list of consecrations in the preceding century, as given by Professor Stubbs, I cannot find any bishop consecrated at Canterbury; and among the different places chosen, evidently to meet the convenience of the primate for the time being, the majority of consecrations took place at Lambeth.\* The chapel still remains, very little changed from what it was in Parker's time; and for its decoration the archbishop had taken due care. The east end was adorned with tapestry; and the floor was covered with crimson cloth. Four sedilia on the south side of the chancel were assigned to the bishops about to take part in the consecration; before each seat was a faldstool

Prepara-  
tions for  
the conse-  
cration.  
Dec. 17,  
1559.

\* See Ducarel's Lambeth.

CHAP.  
VIII.Matthew  
Parker.  
1559-75.

covered with a carpet, and with cushions to match. A throne, with a faldstool before it, adorned with hangings and cushions, was placed on the north side of the sanctuary, to be occupied by the archbishop as soon as he was consecrated.

It is expedient to note these things, as it is the pleasure of some writers to represent the whole proceeding as done in a hole and corner, in a careless and slovenly manner. We may very much doubt whether so much care has been expended in the decoration of the chapel at any subsequent consecrations.\*

Matthew  
Parker's  
friends as-  
semble at  
Lambeth.

\* On the morning of the 17th of December, 1559, the friends, official and personal, of Matthew Parker assembled at Lambeth, where he had some time before taken up his abode. Edmund Grindal, Richard Cox, and Edwin Sandys, divines already designated to bishoprics, were doubtless there; together with Anthony Huse, Esq., principal and head registrar to the archbishop; Thomas Argall, Esq., registrar of the Prerogative Court of Canterbury; and Thomas Willett and John Incent, notaries public. Parker's half-brother, John Baker, is mentioned as having been present, and with him we find associated Thomas Doyle and John March. Among his private friends was his kinsman, the Earl of Nottingham, to whom we are indebted for some interesting particulars with reference to the ceremonial.† The earl, as

\* Complaint is often made of the disregard of solemnities of the sanctuary too often manifested by English bishops in the exercise of their episcopal functions. Humility is a virtue, but the pride that apes humility is offensive.

† For Parker's pedigree, see ante, p. 5. This Earl of Nottingham, who was born in 1536, was present, at the age of twenty-three, at the consecration of Archbishop Parker, and, though himself a Roman Catholic, he afterwards testified to the fact in his place in parliament. The truth of the statement made in the text is fully established by a letter, the original of which, through the kindness of Mr. Dickenson of

we have said, claimed a distant relationship with the archbishop through his mother. They assembled at an early hour—between five and six in the morning—for it was customary, not only in the Church of England, but in the Churches also of France, Spain, and Italy, for the consecration of a bishop to take place at a very early hour in the morning, because, as the celebration of the Holy Communion forms part of the service, and the Holy Communion was received fasting, a service so long as the consecration service undertaken by elderly men might have produced exhaustion.\*

With the exception of Coverdale, who, for some reason not given, appeared only in his cassock, such as the English clergy were accustomed to wear, the bishops appeared in their episcopal vestments; and the archbishop elect in his scarlet robes, such as are now worn in Convocation. As they drew near the chapel the west door was thrown open, and they were received by vergers carrying lights before them. When the congregation had taken their places, morning prayer began, the archbishop's chaplain, Andrew Pearson, officiating. The sermon was preached, as the reporter gave judgment, not inelegantly, by John Scory, Bishop of Chichester, about to be translated to Hereford, to which see he had already been elected. His

CHAP.  
VIII.  
Matthew  
Parker.  
1559-75.

Norton House, has been placed in my hands, and which I do not print *in extenso*, as it has been already published by Mr. Pocock, in the year 1865, in his valuable edition of Burnet's Reformation, to which I make frequent reference in the text. It was written by Mr. Hampton, chaplain to the Earl of Nottingham and an ancestor of Mr. Dickenson, and it shows that he frequently repeated, in private conversation, the statement he publicly made.

\* See Martene, *De Antiq. Eccl. Rit. lib. I. c. 8, Art. 10, § 13.* In the primitive Church the third hour was appointed, in memory of the descent of the Holy Ghost upon the Apostles at Pentecost. It was so ordered in the Middle Ages by Pope Anacletus.—Gratian, *Dist. lxxv.*; Honorius, *lib. I. cap. clxxxix.*



CHAP.  
VIII.

Matthew  
Parker.

1559-75.

lordship certainly selected an appropriate text, 1 Peter v. 1 :—"The elders which are among you I exhort, who am also an elder."

The sermon ended, the bishops and their attendants retired to the vestry to array themselves for the Holy Communion. Bishop Barlow, being the celebrant, returned to the chapel, wearing over him a silk cope ; and in silk copes appeared also Archdeacon Bullingham and Archdeacon Gheast, the chaplains to the archbishop, who were to be assistants.

Consecra-  
tion ser-  
vice.

The consecration was conducted strictly in accordance with the second ordinal of Edward VI.\* This ordinal is nearly identical with that which is now in use. The only point we should remark is, that there is a slight mention in the form of the special office for which, and of the mode through which, the offered grace is conveyed. The archbishop or presiding prelate is now directed to say, when the elect is kneeling on his knees before him, and all the bishops present are laying their hands on his head, "Receive the Holy Ghost, for the office and work of a bishop in the Church of God, now committed unto thee by the imposition of our hands ; in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost. Amen. And remember that thou stir up the grace of God which is given thee by this imposition of our hands ; for God hath not given us the spirit of fear, but of power, and love, and soberness." At the consecration of Archbishop Parker, all the bishops who laid their hands upon him,

\* The Earl of Nottingham says that he was ordained by the form in King Edward's Common Prayer Book. "I myself," he says, "had the book in my hand all the time, and went along with the ordination ; and when it was over I dined with 'em, and there was an instrument drawne up of the form and order of it, which instrument I saw and redd over." The letter is given by Pocock, Burnet's Reform. v. 554.

said, as with one voice, "Take the Holy Ghost, and remember thou stir up the grace of God which is in thee by imposition of hands; for God hath not given us the spirit of fear, but of power, and love, and soberness."

CHAP.  
VIII.  
Matthew  
Parker.  
1559-75.

The service ended, the Lord Archbishop of Canterbury, accompanied by the four bishops, now his suffragans, returned by the north door into the vestry, there to unrobe. When he reappeared, he was vested in a white rochet and a chimere of black silk, wearing "round his neck a collar or scarf made of precious sabellina furs, commonly called sables."\*

At the west door the archbishop paused. His half-brother, John Baker, was there to congratulate him, and to him the archbishop gave a staff, by which he was constituted treasurer; to John Doyle another staff was given, which he received as steward of the household; John Marche was, by a similar process, made the controller. The archbishop then proceeded to the hall, "the gentle people" of his family related by blood preceding him, the rest following him. Lord Nottingham states that there was "a great deal of company." Certainly there was no lack of ceremony, and no desire to conduct business privately.

The day closed. The company departed. The archbishop was at his desk in his private apartment. Before "kneeling on his knees" he wrote:—"On the 17th of December, 1559, I was consecrated Archbishop of Canterbury. Alas! alas! O Lord God, for what times hast Thou kept me! Now I am come into deep waters, and

\* The reader will probably remember the occasional disputes among the cathedral clergy as to the right to wear scarves. The scarf has, of late, been confounded with the stole. The object in wearing the scarf was not to add an ornament to the ministerial dress, but simply to keep off cold. Fur scarves are seen in the portraits of Warham, Cranmer, Parker, and many others.

CHAP.  
VIII.Matthew  
Parker.

1559-75.

the flood hath overwhelmed me. O Lord, I am oppressed! Answer for me and 'stablish me with thy free spirit, for I am a man that hath but a short time to live, &c. Give me thy sure mercies, &c."\*

These were words not intended to meet any eye but his own, and the hasty conclusion of them shows that he was impatient to throw himself upon his knees before his Saviour and his God.

Enthroned  
by proxy.

Parker's presence was required in London, and he could spare neither the time nor the money which would have been consumed if he had been enthroned in person. He was therefore enthroned by proxy, but was careful that all things should be done strictly in accordance with ancient precedent. The restitution of the temporalities of the see was made on the 1st of March, decayed and diminished as they had undoubtedly been, during the vacancy, by the avarice of the queen, and the rapacity of her favourites. The queen's conscience seems, however, to have reproached her, and some allowance was made to Parker to enable him to encounter the great expenses of taking possession of his plundered see. In a MS. memorandum at Lambeth, it is said, "there was taken from the see of Canterbury, of the temporalities, consisting of manors, sites of priories, dominical lands, parks, &c., in Kent, Sussex, and Salop, to the clear yearly value of 1,282*l.* 6*s.* 8*d.*, for which was returned now, in recompense, the tenths of the diocese of Canterbury, of 478*l.* 10*s.* 5½*d.*, and in parsonages impropriate, 357*l.* 15*s.* 11½*d.*, and in annual rents, 447*l.* 9*s.* 6½*d.*, so that by these valuations the recompense was set down to exceed the lands taken by 34*s.* 5¼*d.*, as before in particulars is written. The queen of her favour gave unto him in Michaelmas rents, A.D. 1559, 1,235*l.* 9*s.* 7*d.*"

\* Corresp. p. 484.

It is worthy of remark, that it is seldom that really ambitious men reach the height at which they aim ; and that honours are frequently thrust upon others who, though alive to the advantages of their position, would, under a deep sense of the attendant responsibilities, have chosen for themselves the second place rather than the first. So was it with Matthew Parker.

Of his consecration a record is preserved in his register. It is written in Latin, but has been frequently translated ; it is hastily drawn up, and is only so far valuable, as it is a contemporary and anticipatory refutation of the falsehoods many years afterwards invented and propagated by certain unprincipled Romanists.

CHAP.  
VIII.

Matthew  
Parker.

1559-75.



## APPENDIX TO CHAPTER VIII.

CHAP.  
VIII.

Matthew  
Parker.  
1559-75.

I CAN scarcely condescend to notice the Nag's Head fable. It reflects eternal disgrace upon some modern Romanists that they persevere in propagating the falsehood among the ignorant, when they are aware that we find its best refutation in the writings of some distinguished men of their own communion, such as Charles Butler, Canon Tierney, and, above all, Dr. Lingard. A disregard of truth is often brought as a general charge against the Romanists; they ought, therefore, to be especially careful about the statements made. The story is easily told. In the year 1604, forty-four years after Parker's consecration, an exiled Romanist priest, of the name of Hollywood (or Asacrobosco), brought forward the story in a controversial book printed at Antwerp. The story, which has long since been abundantly refuted, and which, as has just been said, is given up by learned Romanists, was to the following effect:—The queen, it is alleged, issued her warrant, directed to the Bishop of Llandaff, to Dr. Scory, Bishop elect of Hereford, to Dr. Barlow, elect of Chichester, to Dr. Coverdale, sometime Bishop of Exeter, to Dr. Hodgkins, suffragan of Bedford, to consecrate the archbishop. These persons, it is said, met at the Nag's Head Tavern, where it had been usual for the Dean of Arches and the civilians to refresh themselves after the confirmation of a bishop; and there one Neale, who was Bonner's chaplain, peeped through a hole in the door. There he is reported to have seen the other bishops very importunate with Llandaff, who had been dissuaded by Bonner from assisting in this consecration. When the Bishop of Llandaff adhered to this determination, and obstinately refused to assist in the proceedings, Dr. Scory desired the others to kneel, and he laid the

Bible on each of their shoulders or heads, and pronounced these words, "Take thou authority," &c., and so they stood up all bishops. By the propagators of this ridiculous story, it is forgotten that, if it had been true, there were controversialists on their side who would certainly not have left it unheard-of for five-and-forty years. But on this subject the reader shall be referred to Dr. Lingard, whose vindication of Barlow we have before quoted in response to a letter addressed to the Birmingham (Roman) Catholic Magazine of 1834. He says to the editor:—"In your last number a correspondent, under the signature of T. H., has called upon me to show why I have asserted that Archbishop Parker was consecrated on the 17th of December, 1559. Though I despair of satisfying the incredulity of one who can doubt after he has examined the documents to which I refer, yet I owe it to myself to prove to your readers the truth of my statement, and the utter futility of any objection that may be brought against it.

"I. The matter in dispute is—whether Parker received, or did not receive, consecration on the 17th of December; but the following facts are and must be admitted on both sides:—That the queen, having given the royal assent to the election of Parker by the Dean and Chapter of Canterbury, sent, on the 9th of December, a mandate to six prelates to confirm and consecrate the archbishop elect, and that they demurred, excusing, as would appear from what followed, their disobedience by formal exceptions on points of law. 2. That on the 6th of December she issued a commission to seven bishops, ordering them, or any four of them, to perform that office, with the addition of a sanatory clause, in which she supplied, by her supreme authority, all legal or ecclesiastical defects on account of the urgency of the time and the necessity of the things, *temporis ratione et rerum necessitate id postulante*, which prove how much the queen had the consecration at heart. Certainly not without reason, for at that time, with the exception of Llandaff, there was not a diocese provided with a bishop, nor, as the law then stood, could any such provision be made without a consecrated archbishop to confirm and consecrate the bishops elect. 3. That four out of seven bishops named in the commission—(they had been deprived

CHAP.  
VIII.

Matthew  
Parker.  
1559-75.

CHAP.  
VIII.

Matthew  
Parker.  
1559-75.

or disgraced under Queen Mary, but had now come forward to offer their services and solicit preferments in" [what Lingard is pleased to call] "the new Church)—having obtained a favourable opinion from six counsel learned in the law, undertook to execute the commission and confirm Parker's election on the 9th of December.

"II. Now, these facts being indisputable, what, I ask, should prevent the consecration from taking place? The queen required it; Parker, as appears from his subsequent conduct, had no objection to the ceremony, and the commissioners were ready to perform it, or rather were under an obligation to do so, for by the twenty-fifth of Henry VIII., revived in the last parliament, they were compelled, under the penalty of *præmunire*, to proceed to the consecration within twenty days after the date of the commission. Most certainly all these preliminary facts lead to the presumption that the consecration did actually take place about the time assigned for it, the 17th of December, a day falling within the limits I have just mentioned.

"III. In the next place, I must solicit your attention to certain indisputable facts subsequent to that period. These are, first, that on the 18th—and the day is remarkable—the queen sent for Parker no fewer than six writs, addressed to him under the new style of Matthew, Archbishop of Canterbury, and Primate and Metropolitan of all England, and directing him to proceed to the confirmation and consecration of six bishops elect for six vacant sees. This was the first time during the six months which had elapsed since his election that any such writ had been directed to him. What, then, could have happened just before the 18th to entitle him to this new style, and to enable him to confirm and consecrate bishops, which he could not do before? The obvious answer is, that he himself had been consecrated on the 17th. 2nd. That on the 21st he consecrated four new bishops, on the 21st of January five others, two more on the 2nd, and two on the 24th of March. Can we suppose that as much importance would be attached to consecration given by him if he had received no consecration himself, or that the new Church" [so, as a controversialist, Lingard designates the reformed Church] "would

have been left so long without bishops at all if it had not been thought necessary that he who was by law to consecrate others should previously receive that rite? 3rd. That afterwards, at the same time with the new prelates, he received the restoration of his temporalities, a restoration which was never made till after consecration. 4th. That he not only presided at the consecration, but sat in successive parliaments, which privilege was never allowed to any but consecrated bishops. In my judgment, the comparison of these facts with those which preceded the 17th of December, form so strong a case that I should not hesitate to pronounce in favour of the consecration, if even all direct and positive evidence respecting it had perished.

“IV. But there exists evidence in abundance. That Parker was consecrated on the 17th of December is asserted first by Camden (i. 49), second by Godwin (*De Præsul.* p. 212), third by the archbishop himself in his work *De Antiquitate Britannicæ Ecclesiæ*, published in 1572, three years before his death; or, if that book be denied to be his, in his Diary, in which occurs the following entry in his own hand:—‘17th Dec. ann. 1559. *Consecratus sum in Archiepiscopum Cantuariensem. Heu, heu, Domine Deus, in quæ tempora servâsti me!*’—Strype’s Parker (App. ix.); and, fourth, by the archiepiscopal register, a record which details the whole proceedings, with the names of the bishops, of their chaplains, and of the official witness.

“V. Now to this mass of evidence, direct and indirect, what does your correspondent oppose?” Having alluded to the opinion oppugning the validity of the consecration, from the Romish point of view, he says, that if Dr. Milner has expressed a doubt as to the *fact* of the consecration, he must have written hastily, and without consideration. “*I am not aware,*” he continues, “of any open denial of the facts, till about fifty years afterwards, when the tale of the foolery supposed to have been played at the Nag’s Head was first published. In refutation of that story, Protestant writers applied to the register; their opponents disputed its authority, and the consequence was, that in 1614 Archbishop Abbot invited Colleton, arch-priest, with two or three other [Roman] Catholic

CHAP.  
VIII.

Matthew  
Parker.  
1559-75.



CHAP.  
VIII.Matthew  
Parker.  
1559-75.

missioners, to Lambeth, and submitted the register to their inspection, in the presence of six of his own episcopal colleagues. The details may be seen in Dodd, ii. 227, or in Godwin, p. 219.

“VI. Your correspondent assures us that the register contains so many inaccuracies and points at variance with the history of the times, as manifestly prove it a forgery. Were it so, there still remains sufficient evidence of the fact. But what induces T. H. to make this assertion? Has he examined into all the circumstances of the case, or does he only take for granted the validity of several objections, which are founded on misconception or ignorance that the register agrees in every particular with what we know of the history of the times, and there exists not the semblance of a reason for pronouncing it a forgery?”

Thus wrote Dr. Lingard to the editor of the Birmingham (Roman) Catholic Magazine in 1834; and in the rejection of a statement so absurd he is supported by Canon Tierney in his notes on Dodd, and by Mr. Butler in his fourth letter to Bishop Philpotts. The whole subject is more concisely, and with more accurate learning, investigated by Professor Stubbs, in his letter to a Russian friend, ‘On the Apostolical Succession in the Church of England.’ But for obvious reasons I have preferred the refutation of the fable by a divine of the Church of Rome.

It is not my business to investigate every absurd invention suggested by party rancour, in ignorance or in malice, and produced half a century after the occurrences to which they refer had taken place. I have simply to state the historical facts as they are rendered to us by public documents or private correspondence; but the Nag’s Head fable is still so often asserted among the ignorant as an historical fact, that I have thought it right to notice it in this place; and it is to the credit of the Roman Church that I have been enabled to expose the fiction by the letter of a Roman Catholic historian, to whose learning persons of every communion are willing to do honour.

## CHAPTER IX.

## PROCEEDINGS IMMEDIATELY AFTER PARKER'S CONSECRATION.

Parker's position as Primate.—Archbishop Heath's letter of remonstrance.—

Parker's reply.—Treatment of the non-juring bishops.—Change of policy at Rome.—Death of Paul IV.—Pius IV. and Queen Elizabeth.—Invitation to the Council of Trent.—Elizabeth an avowed Catholic.—Consecration of bishops.—Correspondence with John Calvin.—Rules for ordination.—Lay help.—Disagreement among the bishops.—Fire at St. Paul's.—The episcopal assessors.—John Jewel.—His sermon at Paul's Cross.—Apology for the Church of England.—Sketch of the condition of the English Church.

It is purposed in this chapter to confine our attention to the external affairs of the Church; the doctrinal reforms in which Parker was concerned will come under our notice in a subsequent chapter.

CHAP.  
IX.

Matthew  
Parker.

1559-75.

Upon the labours of Queen Elizabeth and her advisers, we have already had occasion to offer a few remarks. When we consider what was accomplished, within the brief limits of one year, in rendering her government firm at home and respected abroad, we cannot but feel indignant at the attempt made, in modern times, to rob the distinguished statesmen of this reign of the approbation so justly accorded to them by their contemporaries, and by the succeeding generation, who enjoyed the prosperity their labours had effected.

What may fairly be predicated of the great statesman of the day, William Cecil, Lord Burghley, may with equal fairness be said, with reference to ecclesiastical affairs, in praise of Matthew Parker. The difficulties with which he

CHAP.  
IX.

Matthew  
Parker.  
1559-75.

had to contend were many and great, and the support he received was precarious and insufficient. In Cecil our primate found a constant friend; but, even with his friendly intentions, political considerations were sometimes permitted to interfere. Bacon was, in some measure, brought under the influence of the Puritans, and upon his support Parker could not always calculate beforehand. The queen's conduct was capricious and irritating. She entirely agreed with Parker in his principles; she was fiercely indignant if, at any time, he seemed to deviate from them, or to yield to his opponents; but through temper, through the influence of favourites, or, as we have suggested, through mere caprice, her support was not unfrequently withheld at the very time when Parker stood most in need of it. She seemed occasionally to take a malignant pleasure in adding to the difficulties of her servants, although they were confident that, in any extreme case, she would come powerfully to their aid.

An opportunity was soon offered to the primate, by the non-juring bishops, for declaring himself to be so strongly in favour of the Reformation, as to satisfy his opponents on the Protestant side, with the exception of those only who would be satisfied with nothing short of the surrender of all Church principle. Archbishop Heath was inclined to regard the considerate kindness he had experienced as a sign of weakness as well as of friendship; and acting under the influence of foreign pressure, he, in concurrence with his brethren, addressed a remonstrance and reproof to their new metropolitan. Nothing could be more opportune for Archbishop Parker. He availed himself of the occasion to inform Archbishop Heath, and the prelates who had adhered to him, that the time for conference and reconciliation had passed. The dissenting prelates had taken one line, the Puritans

Arch-  
bishop  
Heath's  
letter of  
remon-  
strance to  
Arch-  
bishop  
Parker.  
1560.

another: Parker was determined thenceforth to take a line of his own. Opposed to Papists and Puritans, his object was, as we have in a former chapter remarked, to create out of the moderate men a school of thought, which was soon, under Hooker and his followers, to be developed into what is now called Anglicanism. In his reply to the address of Archbishop Heath and his co-religionists, Archbishop Parker began by affirming, that it was the pride, the covetousness, and the usurpations of the Bishop of Rome and his predecessors, that had compelled the princes of the earth to defend their territories and their privileges from that wicked Babylon and her bishop. Then addressing himself directly to his correspondents, he said:—

CHAP.  
IX.

Matthew  
Parker.

1559-75

Parker'  
reply.

“Whereas you and the rest of the late expulsed bishops have scandalized our reformed clergy within these her majesty’s realms, that we yield no subjection unto Christ and his Apostles, we yield more than the fathers of the Romish tribe do; for we honour and adore Christ as the true Son of God, equal with his Father, as well in authority as in majesty, and do make Him no foreigner to the realm, as you members and clergy of the Church of Rome do; but we profess Him to be our only Maker and Redeemer, and ruler of his Church, not only in this realm, but also in all nations, unto whom princes and preachers are but servants; the preachers to propose, the princes to execute, Christ’s will and commandments, whom you, and all that desire to be saved, must believe and obey, against all councils and tribunals who do dissent from his word, whether regal or papal.”

The archbishop went on to declare, that the like reverence was paid to the Apostles by the friends of the Reformation, as they received their writings “with exacter



CHAP.  
IX.Matthew  
Parker.

1559-75.

obedience, than Romanists do," and never allowed the Scriptures to be superseded by the will of men. He remarked, that our Reformation detested those false principles, by which popes and papal writers added, altered, and diminished, yea, even dispensed with not only the writings of the Apostles, but also the very words of our Lord himself; that we acknowledged as lawful councils of the Church, whether provincial or œcumenical, those only which had been convened by religious princes in conjunction with their prelates; but that we owned no subjection to popish tribunals. He quoted Saint Cyprian to show that Saint Peter claimed no subjection to himself, and he begged them to observe—"how we of the Church of England, reformed by our late King Edward and his clergy, and now by her majesty and hers reviving the same, have but imitated and followed the examples of the ancient and worthy fathers." He appealed to Saint Augustine, as well as to Saint Cyprian, affirming that we had the authority of these and other fathers for our denial of the proud demands of Rome; and he proceeded to show that they, as bishops, were treading in the steps of their predecessors—those British bishops who, of old, held authority independent of Rome within this realm. "I, and the rest of our brethren," he continued, "the bishops and clergy of the realm, supposed ye to be our brethren in Christ; but we be sorry that ye, through your perverseness, have separated yourselves not only from us, but from these ancient fathers and their opinions; and that ye permit one man to have all the members of your Saviour Christ Jesus under his subjection; this your wilful opinion is not the way to reduce kings, princes, and their subjects to truth, but rather to blindfold them into utter darkness." He ended with saying: "Consider, therefore, of these

things; and it shall be the continual prayers of our reformed Church to convert ye all to the truth of God's word, to obedience to your sovereign Lady Elizabeth our queen, which in so doing ye glorify Christ and the Eternal God, which is in heaven, and is solely the chief and absolute ruler of princes." He signed himself "your faithful brother in Christ, MATTHEW CANTUARIENSIS."\*

CHAP.  
IX.  
Matthew  
Parker.  
1559-75.

Controversy on this side now ceased. Parker was given to understand, that there would be no factious opposition on the part of the non-jurors to the new primate, and it has been even asserted, although I have seen no proof of the fact, that Heath and Tunstall had sent in their adhesion to the government. It reflects great credit upon the primate, and upon Elizabeth's government in general, that notwithstanding their dissent, the deprived prelates were treated with the greatest consideration and kindness. Parker was very lenient in pressing the oath of supremacy.† Heath, the Archbishop of York, being a man of fortune, lived at his own private house at Chobham, within four miles of Windsor,‡ and at his residence he frequently received visits from the queen. Bishop Thirlby lived with Parker, both at Lambeth and at Bekesbourne, the archiepiscopal residence near Canterbury. He did not die till August 26, 1570; and, according to Bishop Godwin, he found more happiness, though nominally under restraint, during this period of his life, than he had done heretofore in the midst of the fullest stream of his highest honours.§ On his death, the archbishop had him decently buried within the chancel of the parish church of Lambeth, where a fair stone was laid upon his grave. Dr. Tunstall,

Generous  
treatment  
of the non-  
juring  
bishops.

\* Corresp. p. 109-113.

† Collier, vi. 368.

‡ Not Cobham: see Zurich Letters, ii. 182.

§ Godwin, p. 334.

CHAP.  
IX.Matthew  
Parker.

1559-75.

the ex-Bishop of Durham, and Parker had long been friends, and the friendship was not disturbed by differences of opinion. Of Feckenham, the deposed Abbot of Westminster, we have had occasion before to speak. The plan adopted with the recusant bishops was to quarter them upon one of the conforming prelates; and, as was the case with Parker, the prelate upon whom this duty was imposed permitted his prisoner, if he was to be so accounted, to live as one of the family. The custodian was only responsible for the prelate under his care, that he should not leave the country. "These prelates," says Fuller, "had sweet chambers, soft beds, warm fires, plentiful and wholesome diet, each bishop faring like an archbishop, differing nothing from their former living, saving *that* was on their own charges, and *this* at the cost of another." Something must have depended, of course, upon the temper of the host, and something also on that of the compulsory guest. Feckenham was quartered on Horn, Bishop of Winchester, a learned, but disputatious narrow-minded man, and on both sides a controversial spirit betrayed itself; so that, after a time, they came to an agreement, that Feckenham should have private apartments in the palace, and live independently, no longer as one of the family, though he sometimes mingled in it. Bishop Bonner was a low, coarse, vulgar man: he was at first quartered on the Bishop of Lincoln, but made himself so disagreeable, that, at last, he was placed within the rules of the Marshalsea prison; that is, he was permitted to occupy within a prescribed circuit a house of his own, being restrained from passing beyond certain boundaries. The bishops thus accommodated conformed more or less to the new order of things; but to this Dr. White and Dr. Watson could not conscientiously submit. Watson was at first committed to the custody of

Grindal, Bishop of London, and afterwards to that of Cox, Bishop of Ely. Instead, however, of meeting courteous treatment with courtesy, Watson was found "preaching against the State," and it was deemed necessary to place him under closer restraint. Wisbech Castle\* was assigned to him for a residence, and there, in 1584, he died.

CHAP.  
IX.

Matthew  
Parker.  
1559-75.

In short, as is stated in a contemporary pamphlet,† "most of them, and many other of their sort, for a great time, were retained in bishops' houses in a very civil and courteous manner, without danger to themselves or their friends; until the time that the pope began, by his bulls and messages, to offer trouble to the realm by stirring up rebellion." When assassination—the assassination of the queen—was preached as a virtue by the followers of the pope, the papists could no longer expect toleration. But some years were to elapse before a popish sect, with such a principle, was established in England.

When the authorities at Rome became gradually aware of the strength of Elizabeth's government, and of her resolution, while maintaining her own views, to make the necessary concessions to the Protestants, the policy of the papal court was suddenly changed. Even Paul IV., who died August 18, 1559, had arrived at the conviction, that Elizabeth was not to be terrified into submission; and when the aged John Angelo dei Medici succeeded to the papal office, it became quite clear, that specific measures would be adopted. Known in papal history as Pius IV., he addressed a letter to the queen, dated the 5th of May, 1560. He sent her his apostolical

Change of  
policy at  
Rome.

Death of  
Paul IV.  
18th of  
August,  
1559.

Letter ad-  
dressed by  
Pius IV.  
to Queen  
Elizabeth.  
1560.

\* Godwin, p. 361.

† Printed in Somers's Tracts, i. 193. When party feeling ran high, occasional instances of harshness must have occurred, but the desire to treat with kindness and consideration all except political offenders is undeniable.



CHAP.  
IX.Matthew  
Parker.

1559-75.

benediction, saying, that in his desire to provide for her salvation and the establishment of her kingdom, he had determined to forward to her certain instructions by the hand of a nuncio, Vincentio Parpaglia, a prelate well known in England in the time of the late archbishop, Cardinal Pole. He entreated her to put away her evil counsellors, men who sought to further their own objects, instead of labouring for her cause. He promised her the support of the papal court, if she would act on his advice and dismiss her ministers. At the same time, he unconsciously betrayed his haughtiness, by saying, that he—the poor old pope—was ready to receive the Queen of England into favour on her penitence, even as the parent in the gospel received his prodigal child. He hoped to be able to communicate to the fathers about to be re-assembled in an œcumenical or general Council, an account of her repentance; an account which, he informed her, could not fail to add to the joy of heaven itself. Other matters he left to be more fully explained by Vincentio, whom he entreated her to hear.

This letter is given in Camden; and, if it is authentic—a fact which has been questioned—it must have been intended simply to supply the credentials to Vincentio. It was in another letter, of indisputable authenticity, that a formal overture was made to the queen, on the part of the pope, to the effect, that on condition of her adhesion to the see of Rome, the pope would approve of the Book of Common Prayer, including the Liturgy or Communion Service, and the Ordinal. Although his holiness complained, that many things were omitted in the Prayer Book which ought to be there, he admitted that the book, nevertheless, contained nothing contrary to the truth, while it certainly comprehended all that is necessary for salvation. He was therefore prepared to authorize the

Book of Common Prayer, if her majesty would receive it from him and on his authority.\*

The letter containing this proposal was probably despatched from Brussels; for it is certain that Vincentio Parpaglia waited there for permission to appear in England; and that he continued to abide there until he received an official notification, that the English government could not, without a transgression of the ancient laws of the land, sanction the presence in the realm of a papal nuncio.

In this refusal to receive the papal nuncio, the government acted according to precedent, and no incivility was implied. It had long been the law of the land that no legate or nuncio from Rome could land in this country until the consent of parliament had been obtained. As an unfavourable answer would be returned, it was an act of civility to offer the suggestion, that it would be better not to put the question.

In fact, the papal offer had come too late. The queen had been obliged, by the insulting and impolitic conduct of the preceding pope, to take her stand with the Protestants; and she would not condescend "to play fast and

CHAP.  
IX.

Matthew  
Parker.

1559-75.'

Elizabeth  
refuses to  
receive the  
papal  
nuncio.

\* Lord Justice Coke, at the Norwich assizes, in 1606, only three years after the queen's death, made publicly the statement as given in the text, adding, "I have often heard from the queen's own mouth, and I have frequently conferred with noblemen of the highest rank of the State who had seen and read the pope's letter on this subject, as I have related it to you. And this is as true as I am an honest man."—*Charge 28.* See *The Defence of the Dissertation of the English Ordinations*, p. 260. Sir Roger Twysden, in his *Historical Vindication of the Church of England in point of Schism*, p. 176, being well acquainted with Coke's charge, adds, "I myself have received it [the story] from such as I cannot doubt it, they having had it from persons of high relation unto them who were actors in the managing of the business." The subject is discussed by Mr. Chancellor Harington and by an anonymous correspondent in *Notes and Queries*.

CHAP.  
IX.

Matthew  
Parker.

1559-75.

loose." If the proposal had been made sooner, the whole character of the English Reformation would probably have been changed,—whether for the better or for the worse, who can say? But now the die had been cast; and when, soon after, it was notified to the English government that Jerome Martinengo, under a commission from the pope, was on his way to England, he was warned not to proceed further than Flanders.

Invitation  
to the  
Council of  
Trent.

It had been determined at Rome, after much discussion and doubt, to resume the sessions of the Council of Trent; and the determination was formally announced by Pope Pius IV. to the princes in connection with the see of Rome. It was communicated also, but in different terms, to the Protestant princes: Protestants were invited to attend, but not on terms of equality with other potentates. To the Queen of England an invitation was despatched, but Elizabeth would not consent to be herded with the various sects of Protestantism; and she declared herself to be, notwithstanding her reforms—or, all the more, *on account of her reforms*—a Catholic sovereign. Unless she were thus approached, she would not be approached at all. She was prompted by Parker, and the ground they took was intelligible to her contemporaries, however difficult it may appear to the comprehensions of those readers or writers who are ignorant of the principles of the English Reformation, and of the tenets of our great divines. When the ambassador of Philip urged upon the queen the propriety of receiving Martinengo, she replied: "An invidious distinction is made between me *and such other Catholic* potentates as have been invited to this council some time ago. The proposed assembly will also not be free, pious, and christian. Were it likely to possess these characters, I would send to it some religious and zealous persons to represent the Church of England.

Elizabeth  
an avowed  
Catholic.

Any permission of the nuncio's entrance into my dominions is not to be expected from me. His employment here would be, under cover of the council, to foment seditions among a party of my subjects."

CHAP.  
IX.

Matthew  
Parker.

1559-75.

When the Spanish ambassador remonstrated with the queen, and represented such an answer as unusual and discourteous, the queen's reply was:—"To refuse such messengers is no new thing in England. Recently, my sister Mary denied admittance into her territories to the late pope's envoy, who brought a cardinal's hat for William Peto."

From this time friendly intercourse has ceased between England and Rome. The Rubicon was passed. The Church of England, though continuing to be, what she had always been, the Catholic Church of this country, now became Protestant also; Catholic through the apostolical succession, yet Protestant in the sense of protesting against the errors of Rome.\* Her history from this time

\* In the opinion of an Anglican, Protestantism stands opposed, not to Catholicism, but to Popery. It is quite of late years that a party in the English Church disclaimed a title of which some of the highest Anglicans in former times, such as Andrewes, Jeremy Taylor, Ken, and Laud himself, expressed themselves proud. Until the time of the Revolution, Protestant in England was the term used to designate a Church of England man; his opponents were Puritans, Calvinists, Presbyterians, and persons of other denominations. At the Revolution it was desired to find a term to designate all who made common cause against the court of James and the Church of Rome. The term chosen was that of Protestant, which thenceforth was not applied exclusively to members of the Church of England. The confusion occasioned by this proceeding was great, but it becomes worse confounded when the term is repudiated by the representatives of those who for a long period in our history made it their boast that, though they had never ceased to be Catholics, they were, nevertheless, as protesting against Rome, true Protestants. On the Continent, the Anti-Romanists are still divided into Protestants, a term there synonymous with that of Lutherans, and the Reformed, or the disciples of Calvin.



CHAP.  
IX.

Matthew  
Parker.

1559 75.

is a succession of struggles for independence, for she is hated by Romanists for her Protestantism ; and her claim to Catholicism exasperates against her the ultra-Protestant sects. There is, at the present time, a call for union between the Anglo-Catholic and the Roman Catholic teachers of the Church. Those who adhere to the English Reformation have no objection to urge against this, if Rome will yield to England ; but when England is exhorted to become a blind follower of Rome, the Unionists are opposed, and must be opposed to the last.\*

Consecra-  
tion of  
bishops.  
December  
21, 1560.

Upon the archbishop now devolved the duty of continuing the episcopal succession, by consecrating bishops for the vacant dioceses. Before Parker's own consecration, it had been determined that Edmund Grindal should be consecrated for London, Richard Cox for Ely, Edwin Sandys for Worcester, and Rowland Meyrick for Bangor. They were all Episcopalians, and advocates of that revision of the old services of the Church, which came down to them in the form of the Book of Common Prayer ; but how far they would defend the Prayer Book from the attacks incessantly made upon it, by those who contended that our Reformation had not gone far enough, remained to be proved. On the 21st of December, being St. Thomas's Day, these four divines were consecrated by Parker in Lambeth Chapel. And so the Anglican bishops trace their succession up to Parker, through Parker to Augustine, through Augustine to the Apostles, through the Apostles to Christ.

Parker's  
difficulties  
with re-  
gard to the  
episcopate.

The primate had soon to encounter difficulties in another direction. The distinguished men who conformed to the

\* In reference to our relation to Rome, it has been observed, that we may continue to be members of the same family, although two branches of the family may not be on speaking terms the one with the other.

English Reformation, were not all of them prepared to separate, on doctrinal points, from their friends on the Continent; or even from those with whom they had hitherto acted at home. The first question raised had reference to the episcopate. It was objected, that the episcopate connected the Church of England with the Church of Rome; and, in the opinion of the ultra-Protestants, the Church of Rome was Antichrist. The conforming Puritans, therefore, appealed to an authority to which every Puritan would defer as to a pope; they referred at once to one of Calvin's works, in which, with respect to episcopacy, that celebrated man had said: "Let them give us such a hierarchy in which bishops may be so above the rest as they refuse not to be under Christ, but depend upon him as their very head . . . and then if there be any who do not behave themselves with all reverence and obedience towards them, there is no anathema but I confess them worthy of it." \*

Calvin had, indeed, in the year 1549, as Archbishop Parker discovered among the muniments of his see, offered to make King Edward VI. "the defender of his sect, and to invest some of his ministers with quasi-episcopal powers, for the promotion of unity and concord." This letter had been intercepted by Bishops Gardyner and Bonner, who returned an answer as coming from the reformed divines; "wherein," continues Parker, "they checked him and slighted his proposals: from which time John Calvin and the Church of England were at variance in several points, which otherwise, through God's mercy, had been qualified if those papers of his proposals had been discovered unto the queen's majesty during John Calvin's life. But being not discovered until or about the sixth

CHAP.  
IX.

Matthew  
Parker.

1559-75.

\* Strype's Parker, p. 140.

CHAP.  
IX.Matthew  
Parker.

1559-75.

year of her majesty's reign, her majesty much lamented they were not found sooner."\*

The non-conforming Puritans—their wits now sharpened by faction—were not, however, to be imposed upon. They clearly understood, that Calvin merely meant, that he would grant to the moderator of a Presbyterian synod, the style and title of a Bishop, if, by so doing, he could put an end to a controversy which—if it related merely to the question of Church government—would be regarded by himself, and by the generality of serious men, in the light of a dispute insignificant and puerile. They could perceive, that Calvin purposely avoided the vital question of apostolical succession; and thenceforth, until the time of Bilson, Whitgift, Hooker, and the great divines who adorned the close of Elizabeth's reign, the question of episcopacy, as involving the continuity and perpetuity of the Church, was tacitly admitted. Neal, the Puritan historian, simply states, that "it was admitted by the Court reformers"—(so he designates the reformers of the Church of England)—"that the Church of Rome was a true Church, though corrupt in some points of doctrine and government; that all her ministrations were valid, and that the pope was a true Bishop of Rome, *though not of the universal Church*. It was thought necessary to maintain this," he continues, "for the support of the character of our bishops, *who could not otherwise derive their succession from the Apostles*." He goes on to say, "that the English reformers maintained, that the practice of the primitive Church for the first four or five centuries, was a proper standard of Church government and discipline, and in some respects better than that of the Apostles, which, according to them, was only accom-

\* For further quotations to this effect, see Durel's View of the Government and Worship of Almighty God in the Reformed Churches beyond the Seas.

modated to the infant state of the Church, while it was under persecution, whereas theirs was suited to the grandeur of a national establishment.”\* Allowing for the party colouring of the Puritan historian, this statement is in the main correct.

CHAP.  
IX.  
Matthew  
Parker.  
1559-75.

Upon Parker everything now depended, and he threw himself heartily into his work. Other prelates were consecrated at Lambeth on the 21st of January; but his troubles were not confined to a selection of fit persons to occupy the higher offices in the Church. The plague, which, as we have seen, at the close of Queen Mary's reign carried off so many of the bishops, was equally fatal among the parochial clergy. Many parishes were now vacant, and not a few of them had been despoiled and robbed during the vacancies. The archbishop issued to his suffragans, through the Bishop of London, certain questions to be answered relating to the state of their dioceses. He found it difficult to procure, as he desired, a sufficient number of clergymen, well instructed, not violent controversialists, or fanatics, to serve among the parochial clergy; but, great as the difficulty was, he warned the bishops against yielding to the temptation of admitting to the vacant cures men not sufficiently instructed to discharge, with credit to themselves and profit to the people, the functions of the sacred ministry. In a letter addressed to the Bishop of London, and dated August 15, 1560, the archbishop observes that, “now by experience it is seen that such manner of men, partly by reason of their former profane arts, partly by their light behaviour otherwise, and trade of life, are very offensive unto the people; yea and to the wise of this realm are thought to do great deal more hurt than good, the Gospel there sustaining slander.”† The truth is, that

Vacancies  
among the  
parochial  
clergy.

Rules for  
ordina-  
tion.

Letter  
from the  
primate to  
the Bishop  
of London.

\* Neal, i. 101, 102.

† Corresp. p. 120.



CHAP.  
IX.

Matthew  
Parker.

1559-75.

several of the bishops were willing to lay hands upon any persons who exhibited the enthusiasm of piety. The danger of such a proceeding arises from the ease with which such a condition is simulated ; as well as from the fact, that devotional fervour is apt to subside, leaving sometimes a residuum of worse than lukewarmness. A man may begin as an enthusiast, and end as a hypocrite or a worldling. The archbishop charged his suffragans, therefore, "to be very circumspect in admitting any to the ministry, and only to allow such as, having good testimony of their honest conversation, had been traded [*i.e.* trained] and exercised in learning, or at the least had spent their time with teaching of children ; excluding all others which have been brought up and sustained themselves either by occupation or other kinds of life, alienated from learning."

Lay help.

The primate wisely concluded, that it would be preferable to have recourse to lay help, than to give encouragement to these Jeroboam ordinations.\* He drew up "*An order for serving cures now destitute ;*" together with certain regulations, such as could only be drawn up by a man whose Church principles were firmly established. He regarded the distinction between the clergy and the laity as consisting chiefly in this, that the clergy alone were authorized to preach in church and to administer the sacraments. He proposed, therefore, in the present emergency, and not as bearing upon the permanent regulations of the Church, that certain lectors or readers should be licensed by the bishop or his chancellor ; honest, sober,

\* For this mode of proceeding he had a precedent in the primitive Church. The regulations laid down for *Readers* in the Eastern Church may be seen in Bingham. It is to be borne in mind, that it was only now that the fact began to be recognized, that the clergy are to be employed, not only in the various offices of prayer and praise, but also as instructors of the people.

and grave laymen, who should be permitted in destitute churches to say the Litany and to read a homily ; but not of course to baptize, to marry, to minister the Holy Communion, or to preach. He proposed, moreover, that parishes for which no incumbent could be provided should be held *in commendam* by a neighbouring rector, whose duty it would be periodically to visit those parishes to preach the word, to minister the Holy Communion, and to baptize the children. The priest was also to catechize the children, and to ascertain whether they were properly instructed by the lay helper ; and he was to refer all causes of great importance to the bishop.

CHAP.  
IX.

Matthew  
Parker.

1559-75.

Although the archbishop was supported by several of the prelates whose principles were in accordance with his own, yet with some other of his suffragans he could not avoid occasional misunderstandings. This, however, afforded him an opportunity for evincing a union of firmness with good temper, such as is sure, in the long run, to give weight to authority. He complained of the "Germanical natures" which some of the bishops had brought with them from the Continent, and of his meeting opposition where he had a right to expect support. In the disagreements among the bishops, as shown in their letters, and especially in the letter of Parker himself, we find more divergences of opinion than we should have anticipated, but a display of Christian temper which is truly gratifying and instructive.

Disagree-  
ment  
among the  
bishops.

Parker's difficulties were rendered greater by the uncertainty of the queen's temper ; and by the impossibility of calculating from antecedents, what under given circumstances her line of conduct might become. Although she deferred to the judgment of the archbishop, and was even enraged if at any time he seemed to deviate from the principles he had laid down for her guidance, yet from

Differences  
with the  
queen.

CHAP.  
XI.

Matthew  
Parker.

1559-75.

her perverseness and caprice he suffered so much as to be sometimes driven almost to the borders of despair. On one point she was especially perverse—the marriage of the clergy. Her desire was that, as before the Reformation, so now, the marriage of the clergy should be an exception to the rule of celibacy, and should be contracted only under a dispensation from the crown. Here Parker's private feelings made him resolute, and she became sure that she would lose her primate if she did not yield. Throughout the middle ages, as we have seen in preceding volumes, the dispensations to marry could be obtained by the clergy on application to the crown; but the clergy who acted on such dispensations were regarded “as black sheep.” Parker demanded the recognition of clerical marriages as a right; marriage to them, as to all men, was to be a holy and an honourable estate.

Of the visitations held by Parker, on his re-endowment and reform of hospitals and schools, and on his care to remove the scandals still existing in the ecclesiastical courts, we shall have occasion to give a more minute account in a subsequent chapter. He was glad to avail himself of opportunities as they occurred of refreshing his spirits and restoring himself to health by an occasional visit to his country houses; but business required him to be so often in London, that at the commencement of his career he was much in Lambeth; and looking down the river on the 4th of June, 1561, he beheld the magnificent cathedral of St. Paul's in flames. It had been struck with lightning. The fire was at last overcome, but not until the lofty spire, together with the upper roof of the church and aisles, was entirely consumed. The archbishop immediately conferred with the queen as to the measures to be adopted for the restoration of the cathedral, and a public letter was addressed to him, in the usual form,

Fire at St.  
Paul's.  
4th June,  
1561.

through which he was authorized, after consultation with the bishops and the principal members of the clergy, “to devise upon some contribution of money and relief to be levied and collected of the same clergy.” The queen, in her letter to the archbishop, adds :—“Wherein we mean neither to prescribe to you the manner of levying, nor the sum to be contributed, but refer the same to your wisdom and the consideration of so great a work. And if you shall think meet to be informed therein, upon any special doubt, then to resort to our Council, who in that behalf shall give you knowledge and advice of that which shall be convenient.”\*

CHAP.  
IX.  
Matthew  
Parker.  
1559-75.

In those days, no one was permitted to raise money of the queen's lieges, except through parliament, or through Convocation ; through the offertory, or by means of letters patent from the crown. The present system of making public collections at the church doors, or otherwise than in the offertory, was seldom, if ever, resorted to before the Revolution. At that time, the dissenters commenced the system of charity sermons. It was at first regarded as an invasion of the royal prerogative ; but when the authorities did not interfere with the new system, the Church gradually followed the example, until at length charity sermons have become, in many places, a burden hard to bear. As in the case before us, neither parliament nor Convocation was sitting, and as the necessity was urgent, the archbishop was permitted, under a royal mandate, to raise the money necessary for the restoration of the cathedral of London.

Money  
raised for  
the resto-  
ration of  
St. Paul's.

Owing to the impossibility of immediately convening Convocation, the archbishop had recourse to another irregularity. He invited a committee of bishops to con-

\* Corresp. p. 142.



CHAP.  
IX.Matthew  
Parker.

1559-75.

sult with him at Lambeth ; and to make such regulations in ecclesiastical affairs, as would admit the plea of urgency. As all spiritual authority emanates from the bishops, though in national or provincial churches they have delegated a portion of their authority to the second order of the ministry, there could be no objection to this measure as inconsistent with Catholic principles. But authority once granted to, or exercised by the presbyters of a national Church could not be capriciously ignored or tyrannically withdrawn. As the laws of the land, as well as the canons of the Church, protected the second order of the clergy in the exercise of their rights, Parker armed himself with the royal authority before proceeding to act. On the authority of a late act of parliament, consistently with the principles of the Church, he convened a meeting of the bishops, not to create new laws, but to consider how best to carry into effect the laws and the statutes already in existence.

The epis-  
copal as-  
sessus.  
1561.

This meeting, to which was modestly assigned the title of an *assessus*, was held in April, 1561, and at its first session eleven articles were agreed upon. The doctrine of the Holy Trinity was asserted ; as were the sufficiency of holy Scripture ; the three creeds ; the power of the keys as exercised in the Church ; the necessity of ordination ; the fact, that the authority lately exercised by the pope in England was a usurpation ; the agreement of the Book of Common Prayer with Scripture ; the lawfulness of omitting the application of oil, salt, and spittle in the administration of holy baptism ; the distinction between the Mass and the Communion ; the necessity of administering the Holy Communion in both kinds ; the rejection of images, relics, and counterfeit miracles.\*

\* These superstitious practices would have remained in our Church, if they had not been specially abolished. It is to be remembered, al-

At a second session, on April 12, the Archbishop of York attended. He gave his assent to the articles; and orders were issued that they should be subscribed by the clergy licensed to officiate in the dioceses of either province. Other arrangements were suggested by Parker for the discipline of the Church, and sanctioned by his suffragans. An examination of the Scripture readers was to be instituted by the ordinaries; certain cautions were to be taken against simoniacal contracts; the popish service books were to be abolished; marriages within the Levitical degrees were to be disallowed; the archbishops and bishops were to contribute, according to the proportion of their revenues, towards the expenses of learned strangers at Oxford and Cambridge.\*

CHAP.  
IX.  
Matthew  
Parker.  
1559-75.

The primate was agreeably surprised to find, that the bishops were prepared to act cordially with him, in all that related to the discipline of the Church; and in regard to doctrine, he wisely confined attention to the essentials of religion; avoiding, as far as possible, controverted doctrines or subjects likely to promote dissension.

Cordial  
feeling  
between  
Parker  
and the  
bishops.

Parker now felt, that the time had arrived when, not only to England, but to the whole Western Church, should be clearly announced the ecclesiastical position which had been assumed by the English primate and his suffragans, under the supremacy of the queen; her supremacy extending to things temporal, and not, as had

ways, that the Catholics were in possession of our churches; and the Reformation was effected by obtaining concessions from them. Nothing can be further from the truth than the supposition that the Protestants were in possession, and that it was to Catholics, not to Protestants, that concessions were offered. Some of the decisions of the modern Privy Council are to be traced to the fact of the judges not being historians also.

\* Wilkins, iv. 224.

CHAP.  
IX.

Matthew  
Parker.

1559-75.

been wickedly misrepresented, to the discharge of any spiritual functions. The determination of the pope to resume the sessions of the Council of Trent made some such measure the more important, if not absolutely necessary. On this point there could not be two opinions, but the question was, who was to undertake it? Parker himself had not the time to engage in a work of such learning and labour. He was not a man who overestimated his powers. Competent though he knew himself to be, from his patristic learning, for such an undertaking, he was, at the same time, conscious that he did not possess the *vivida vis animi*, the glowing enthusiasm of genius, by which to make such a work interesting as well as instructive. The same might be said of those among the English reformers who concurred in the principles of the Reformation. He was admirably adapted to criticise and revise, but not to compose.

Among the returned and conforming exiles there were some who might have been equal to the task, from their talents and their piety; but they were warped in their principles by their intercourse with foreigners, or else were not sufficiently learned for such an undertaking,

At length the man was found.

John  
Jewel.

On June 18, 1559, John Jewel preached a sermon at Paul's Cross which excited general attention and some surprise. He dared the opponents of the English Reformation to defend their opposition on scriptural principles, or on the principles of the primitive Church.

Parker knew Jewel to be a man of real and substantial learning, and of a nature modest and malleable; and that, although his principles were not as yet quite fixed, he was open to conviction. His antecedents proclaimed him to be a sincere, though a weak man. When, on the accession of Queen Mary, he was called to account for his principles,

he, under fear of torture and the stake, renounced all that laid him open to a suspicion of Protestantism ; but soon after, repenting and recanting, he fled abroad. When first he went to the Continent he was regarded as a representative of the principles of the English Reformation, as maintained by such men as Ridley and Parker ; but open to flattery, and peculiarly sensitive of kindness, he returned to England with an inclination to Calvinism, so far as Calvinism was at that time developed. Although he was prepared to argue for the continuity of the Church, or the identity of the existing Reformed Church with the pre-Reformation Church, he desired to conciliate his old friends by not contending for the retention of the ancient vestments ; although on this point, also, his judgment was not decided.

Of Parker himself we have already remarked, that he possessed one great qualification as a leader ; he was a large-hearted, and not a narrow-minded man. He saw what was excellent in Jewel, and brought his stronger mind to influence Jewel's flexible judgment ; he led him on to compose a work which, if not all that he could wish, was, like the Homilies, well adapted to the exigencies of the time.

Jewel had been again appointed to preach at Paul's Cross ; when, to the satisfaction of the archbishop, and to the astonishment of many among his hearers, he took very high ground. He maintained the Catholicism of the Church of England. He declared that where the Church of Rome differed from the Church of England, Rome was medieval, and England primitive. What was purely medieval was comparatively novel ; what was novel could not be primitive. The Church of England was so decidedly scriptural and primitive, interpreting Scripture according to the light of primitive tradition, that he was

CHAP.  
IX.

Matthew  
Parker.

1559-75.



CHAP.  
IX.

Matthew  
Parker.

1559-75.

content to give up her cause, if her opponents could show, that they had the authority of the fathers or of the tradition of the primitive Church, in favour of any of those doctrines on which the reformed Church of England differed from the Church of Rome. His assertion, repeated in his Apology, was : " We are come as near as we possibly could to the Church of the Apostles and the old Catholic bishops and fathers ; and have directed according to their customs and ordinances, not only our doctrine, but also the sacraments and the form of common prayer." \*

Here was his principle. This is the principle of Anglicanism as distinguished from the foreign reformations : not Luther, not Calvin, but the primitive Church.

The archbishop sought Jewel. He gained influence over him ; and to what extent may be shown by one fact connected with Jewel's history. From an unwillingness to separate from Puritans at home, and from a desire to stand well with his foreign correspondents, Jewel had, as we have remarked, at one time written with indiscreet zeal against the clerical vestments ; but when he became a bishop, few prelates insisted more strongly than he upon obedience to the law in this respect. He was one with Parker ; and the archbishop suggested the appointment of Jewel to the see of Salisbury : having been duly elected, he was consecrated at Lambeth on January 21, 1560.

Jewel appointed  
to the see  
of Salisbury.  
1560.

Jewel's  
sermon at  
Paul's  
Cross.  
Jan. 1560.

On the 18th of June, properly vested, and attended by all those decent ceremonies which pertained to his office, and which folly only will despise, the Lord Bishop of Salisbury ascended again the pulpit at Paul's Cross. Thus arrayed, his appearance was itself a sermon. He

\* Jewel's Works, p. 614.

took his text from 1 Cor. xi. 23-25 :—“ *For I have received of the Lord that which also I delivered unto you, That the Lord Jesus the same night in which he was betrayed took bread: and when he had given thanks, he brake it, and said, Take, eat: this is my body, which is broken for you: this do in remembrance of me. After the same manner also he took the cup, when he had supped, saying, This cup is the new testament in my blood: this do ye, as oft as ye drink it, in remembrance of me.*” He reiterated the challenge he had in substance pronounced on a former occasion. He did so, because it had been rumoured that he had given utterance to more than he was able to maintain.

“ I then said, perhaps boldly, as it might then seem to some men, but as I myself and the learned of our adversaries themselves do well know, sincerely and truly, that none of all them that this day stand against us, are able, or shall ever be able, to prove against us any one of all those points, either by the Scriptures, or by example of the primitive Church, or by the old doctors, or by the ancient general councils. . . . The words that I then spake, as near as I can call them to mind, were these: If any learned man of all our adversaries, or if all the learned men that be alive, be able to bring any one sufficient sentence out of any old Catholic doctor or father, or out of any old general council, or out of the holy Scriptures of God, or any one example of the primitive Church, whereby it may be clearly and plainly proved,

“ That there was any private mass in the whole world at that time, for the space of six hundred years after Christ ;

“ Or that there was then any communion ministered unto the people under one kind ;

CHAP.  
IX.

Matthew  
Parker,  
1559-75.

CHAP.  
IX.

Matthew  
Parker.

1552-75.

“Or that the people had their common prayers then in a strange tongue that they understood not ;

“Or that the Bishop of Rome was then called an universal bishop, or the head of the universal Church ;

“Or that the people were then taught to believe that Christ’s body is really, substantially, corporally, carnally, or naturally in the sacrament ;

“Or that his body is or may be in a thousand places or more at one time ;

“Or that the priest did then hold up the sacrament over his head ;

“Or that the people did then fall down and worship it with godly honour ;

“Or that the sacrament was then, or now ought to be, hanged up under a canopy ;

“Or that in the sacrament after the words of consecration, there remaineth only the accidents and shews without the substance of bread and wine ;

“Or that the priest then divided the sacrament into three parts, and afterwards received himself all alone ;

“Or that whosoever had said the sacrament is a figure, a pledge, a token, or a remembrance of Christ’s body, had therefore been judged for an heretic ;

“Or that it was lawful then to have thirty, twenty, fifteen, ten, or five masses said in one church, in one day ;

“Or that images were then set up in the churches, to the intent that the people might worship them ;

“Or that the lay people was then forbidden to read the word of God in their own tongue ;

“If any man alive were able to prove any of these articles by any one clear or plain clause or sentence, either of the Scriptures or of the old doctors, or of any old general council, or by any example of the primitive

Church, I promised then that I would give over and subscribe unto him."

He declared himself ready not only not to retract anything that he had said on this matter, but also to assert more to the same effect.

"If any one of all our adversaries," he continued, "be able clearly and plainly to prove, by such authority of the Scriptures, the old doctors and councils as I said before,

"That it was lawful for the priest to pronounce the words of consecration closely and in silence to himself ;

"Or that the priest had then authority to offer up Christ unto his Father ;

"Or to communicate and receive the sacrament for another, as they do ;

"Or to apply the virtue of Christ's death and passion to any man by means of the mass ;

"Or that it was then thought a sound doctrine to teach the people, that the mass, *ex opere operato*,—that is, even for that it is said and done,—is able to remove any part of our sin ;

"Or that then any Christian man called the sacrament his Lord and his God ;

"Or that the people was then taught to believe, that the body of Christ remaineth in the sacrament as long as the accidents of bread remain there without corruption ;

"Or that a mouse or any other, worm or beast, may eat the body of Christ (for so some of our adversaries have said and taught) ;

"Or that when Christ said *Hoc est corpus meum*, this *hoc* pointeth not the bread, but *individuum vagum* ; as some of them say ;

"Or that the accidents, or forms, or shews of bread

CHAP.  
IX.

Matthew  
Parker.

1557-75.



CHAP.

IX.

Matthew  
Parker.

1559-75.

and wine, be the sacraments of Christ's body and blood, and not rather the very bread and wine itself ;

"Or that the sacrament is a sign or token of the body of Christ that lieth hidden underneath it ;

"Or that ignorance is the mother and cause of true devotion and obedience—these be the highest mysteries, and greatest keys of their religion, and without them their doctrines can never be maintained and stand upright ;

"If any one of all our adversaries be able to avouch any one of all these articles, by any such sufficient authority of Scriptures, doctors, or councils as I have required, as I said before, so say I now again, I am content to yield unto him and to subscribe. But I am well assured that they shall never be able truly to allege one sentence. And because I know it, therefore I speak it, lest ye hapily should be deceived."\*

We are not in these pages concerned with the controversies to which this celebrated challenge gave rise ; but we may be permitted to remark, that Jewel proved himself to be equal to the emergency, and rose to the occasion. He had, as a polemic, opened, it must be admitted, a prodigious length of line to the attacks of his opponents ; but he confidently defied the enemy to find one assailable point throughout the whole of it ; and we can truly say of this distinguished writer, that, in all essentials, he maintained his defences against the combined forces of an enemy not over scrupulous in assertion.

Parker and Jewel were now brought into close alliance ; and the former rejoiced to find in his *protégé* the very

\* The whole sermon may be seen in the Works of Bishop Jewel (ed. Parker Soc., first portion, p. 3), with an account of the controversies which arose therefrom. I have followed in the above statement the copy of the sermons in Jewel's works, published in 1611.

qualifications for the post he had assumed, and in which the metropolitan was conscious that he was himself deficient. We shall hereafter have occasion to remark on the carelessness with which Parker permitted his patronage to be given to works which he could not have examined in detail, but in whose authors he had confidence. Among the opinions advanced in the well-known Apology for the Church of England, there were some which could not have been in accordance with those of Parker; nevertheless, the primate not only patronized the work, and caused it to be circulated, but, acting in a manner not to be justified, he endeavoured to invest it with a quasi-ecclesiastical authority. This the Church repelled; yet, considering the age and circumstances when and under which the Apology was produced, it may justly be styled a great work. It was in the year 1562 that the celebrated *Apologia Ecclesiæ Anglicanæ* made its appearance. How far Parker was concerned in its composition we know not; but some share in the work he claims for himself in the Prefatory Epistle, in which his sanction to Lady Bacon's English version is conveyed.

CHAP.  
IX.

Matthew  
Parker.

1559-75.

Apology  
for the  
Church of  
England.

Versions of the Apology appeared almost immediately after its publication, in Italian, French, and Spanish, in German and Dutch, and lastly in the Greek language.\* An English version of the Apology was printed almost contemporaneously with the original Latin. It was attributed to Archbishop Parker; but probably, as in some of his other works, he employed a chaplain or a secretary to make the translation, while he himself superintended and corrected it. He certainly did not evince the jealousy of authorship when, in 1564, this version was superseded by a translation by Lady Bacon,† the wife of his friend the

\* Wordsworth, iv. 49. In 1571 it was translated into Welsh.

† Lady Bacon was one of the five daughters of Sir Anthony Cook, of

CHAP.  
IX.Matthew  
Parker.

1559-75.

lord keeper, and the mother of the renowned Lord Bacon. The archbishop received a copy of Lady Bacon's translation in MS. This learned and accomplished lady had, at the same time, sent a copy of it to Jewel; and, not content with having translated a Latin book into English, she accompanied her performance with a letter in Greek, to which the bishop responded in the same language. The primate examined the version carefully, and both he and Jewel himself found it to be so admirably executed, that they would not suggest the alteration of a single word. The archbishop, with singular good taste, instead of returning her the MS., sent her the work in print. It was accompanied by a letter which was prefixed to the translation when published, and which served as the *imprimatur* of the archbishop. It was a delicate compliment. It might have been, he hinted, a violation of confidence to print the book without first consulting the author; but she would, doubtless, pardon the liberty taken, since it secured for the public the perusal of a work so much desired for general use, and at the same time spared her the pain of a conflict with her own scrupulous humility.

The Apology was published with the sanction of the two primates and their suffragans, and under the authority of the queen. To the English version Parker attached, as drawn up by himself, or under his direction, an appendix which contains a brief sketch of the Church of England as it then existed, "with a list of the bishoprics and an account of the universities." Although this tract is long, yet, as it conveys important information, and as it was also

Sketch of  
the con-  
dition of  
the Eng-  
lish  
Church.

Gidea Hall in Essex. Sir Anthony had been preceptor to Edward VI. All his daughters were women of learning. They were good Latin and Greek scholars; one of them, Mildred, was the wife of Queen Elizabeth's great minister Cecil. In the illustrious family of Salisbury the name of Mildred is still retained, and held in honour.

the composition of Parker, it shall be presented to the reader. The primate desired to convey the information contained in the tract to his contemporaries on the Continent; and to us, after an interval of more than three hundred years, it must be interesting to see how the Church of England stood at this period.

“The manner how the Church of England is administered and governed.

“The Church of England is }  
divided into two provinces. } Canterbury and York.

“The province of Canterbury hath

“The archbishop of the same, who is primate of all England, and metropolitan.

“The Bishop of London.

{ Winchester,

{ Ely.

{ Chichester.

{ Hereford.

{ Salisbury.

{ Worcester.

{ Lincoln.

“The Bishop of { Coventry and Lichfield.

{ Bath and Wells.

{ Norwich.

{ Exeter.

{ Rochester.

{ Peterborough.

{ St. Davies.

{ St. Asaph.

“The Bishop of { Llandaff.

{ Bangor.

{ Oxford.

{ Gloucester, and

{ Bristowe.

CHAP.

IX.

Matthew  
Parker.

1559-75.



CHAP.  
IX.Matthew  
Parker.

1559-75.

“The province of York hath

“The archbishop of the same, who is also primate of  
England and metropolitan.

“The Bishop of {Durham.  
                          {Carlisle, and  
                          {Chester.

“Amongst us here in England no man is called or preferred to be a bishop, except he have first received the orders of priesthood, and be well able to instruct the people in the holy Scriptures.

“Every one of the archbishops and bishops have their several cathedral churches; wherein the deans bear chief rule, being men specially chosen both for their learning and godliness, as near as may be.

“These cathedral churches have also other dignities and canonries, whereunto be assigned no idle or unprofitable persons, but such as either be preachers, or professors of the sciences of good learning.

“In the said cathedral churches, upon Sundays and festival days, the canons make ordinarily special sermons, whereunto duly resort the head officers of the cities and the citizens; and upon the workendays, thrice in the week, one of the canons doth read and expound some piece of holy Scripture.

“Also the said archbishops and bishops have under them their archdeacons, some two, some four, some six, according to the largeness of the diocese; the which archdeacons keep yearly two visitations, wherein they make diligent inquisition and search, both of the doctrine and behaviour, as well of the ministers as of the people. They punish the offenders; and if any errors in religion and heresies fortune to spring, they bring those and other weighty matters before the bishops themselves.

“There is nothing read in our churches but the

CHAP.  
IX.Matthew  
Parker.

1559-75.

canonical Scriptures, which is done in such order as that the psalter is read over every month, the New Testament four times in the year, and the Old Testament once every year. And, if the curate be judged of the bishop to be sufficiently seen in the holy Scriptures, he doth withal make some exposition and exhortation unto godliness.

“And, forasmuch as our churches and universities have been wonderfully marred, and so foully brought out of all fashion in time of papistry, as there cannot be had learned pastors for every parish, there be prescribed unto the curates of meaner understanding certain homilies devised by learned men, which do comprehend the principal points of Christian doctrine, as of original sin, of justification, of faith, of charity, and such-like, for to be read by them unto the people.

“As for common prayer, the lessons taken out of the Scriptures, the administering of the sacraments, and the residue of service done in the churches, are every whit done in the vulgar tongue which all may understand.

“Touching the universities,

“Moreover, this realm of } Cambridge, and Oxford.  
England hath two universities.

“And the manner is not to live in these within houses that be inns or a receipt for common guests, as is the custom of some universities; but they live in colleges under most grave and severe discipline, even such as the famous learned man Erasmus of Roterodame, being here amongst us about forty years past, was bold to prefer before the very rules of the monks.

“In Cambridge be xiiii colleges, these by name that follow:—

Trinity College, founded by  
King Henry the Eight.

The King's College.  
St. John's College.

CHAP.  
IX.Matthew  
Parker.  
1559-75.

Christ's College.  
The Queen's College.  
Jesus College.  
Bennet College.  
Pembroke College, or Pembroke Hall.  
Peter College, or Peter House.

Gunwell and Caius College or Hall.  
One other Trinity College, or Trinity Hall.  
Clare College, or Clare Hall.  
St. Katherine's College, or Katherin Hall.  
Magdalene College.

“In Oxford likewise there be colleges, some greater, some smaller, to the number of four and twenty, the names whereof be as followeth :—

The Cathedral Church of Christ, wherein also is a great company of students.  
Magdalene College.  
New College.  
Marten College.  
All Souls' College.  
Corpus Christi College.  
Lincoln College.  
Auriell College.  
The Queen's College.  
Baylie College, or Bailioll College.  
St. John's College.

Trinity College.  
Exeter College.  
Brazen Nose College.  
The University College  
Gloucester College.  
Brodegate Hall.  
Heart Hall.  
Magdalene Hall.  
Alborne Hall.  
St. Mary Hall.  
White Hall.  
New Inn.  
Edmond Hall.

“And besides these colleges that be in the universities, this realm hath also certain collegiate churches, as Westminster, Windsor, Eton, and Winchester. The two last whereof do bring up and find a great number of young scholars, the which, after they be once perfect in the rules of grammar and versifying, and well entered in the principles of the Greek tongue and of rhetoric, are sent from thence unto the universities; as thus : out of Eton College they be sent unto the King's College at Cambridge, and out of Winchester into the New College at Oxford.

“The colleges of both the universities be not only very fair and goodly built, through the exceeding liberality of the kings in old time and of late days, of bishops and of noblemen, but they be also endowed with marvellous large livings and revenues.

“In Trinity College at Cambridge, and in Christ’s College at Oxford, both which were founded by King Henry the Eight of most famous memory, are at the least found four hundred scholars, and the like number well near is to be seen in certain other colleges, as in the King’s College and St. John’s College at Cambridge; in Magdalene College and New College of Oxford, besides the rest which we now pass over.

“Every one of the colleges have their professors of the tongues and of the liberal sciences (as they call them), which do train up youth privately within their halls, to the end they may afterward be able to go forth thence into the common schools as to open disputation, as it were into plain battle, there to try themself.

“In the common schools of both the universities there are found at the king’s charge, and that very largely, five professors and readers, that is to say,—

The Reader of Divinity,  
The Reader of the Civil Law,  
The Reader of Physic,  
The Reader of the Hebrew tongue, and  
The Reader of the Greek tongue.

And for the other professors, as of philosophy, of logic, of rhetoric, and of the mathematical, the universities themselves do allow stipends unto them. And these professors have the ruling of the disputations and other school exercises which be daily used in the common schools, amongst whom they that by the same disputations and exercises are thought to be come to any ripeness in

CHAP.  
IX.  
Matthew  
Parker.  
1559-75.



CHAP.  
IX.Matthew  
Parker.

1559-75.

knowledge, are wont, according to the use in other universities, solemnly to take degrees, every one in the same science and faculty which he professeth.

“We thought good to annex these things, to the end we might confute and confound those that spread abroad rumours, how that with us nothing is done in order, and as ought to be done, that there is no religion at all, no ecclesiastical discipline observed, no regard had of the salvation of men’s souls ; but that all is done quite out of order and seditiously, that all antiquity is despised, that liberty is given to all sensuality and lewd lusts of folks, that the livings of the church be converted to profane and worldly uses ; whereas in very truth we seek nothing else but that that God above all most good may have still his honour truly and purely reserved unto him ; that the rule and way to everlasting salvation may be taken from out of his very word, and not from men’s fantasies ; that the sacraments may be ministered not like a masquery or a stage-play, but religiously and reverently, according to the rule prescribed unto us by Christ, and after the example of the holy fathers which flourished in the primitive Church ; that that most holy and godly form of discipline, which was commonly used amongst them, may be called home again ; that the goods of the church may not be launched out amongst worldlings and idle persons, but may be bestowed upon the godly ministers and pastors which take pain both in preaching and teaching ; that there may from time to time arise up out of the universities learned and good ministers, and others meet to serve the commonwealth ; and finally that all unclean and wicked life may be utterly abandoned and banished, as unworthy for the name of any Christian. And, albeit we are not as yet able to obtain this that we have said, fully and perfittly (for this same stable, as one may rightly call

it, of the Romish Augias, cannot so soon be thoroughly cleansed and rid from the long grown filth and muck); nevertheless this is it whereunto we have regard; hither do we tend; to this mark do we direct our pain and travail, and that hitherto (thorough God his gracious favour) not without good success and plenteous increase, which thing may easily appear to everybody, if either we be compared with our own selves, in what manner of case we have been but few years since, or else be compared with our false accusers, or rather our malicious slanderers.

“The Lord defend his Church, govern it with his Holy Spirit, and bless the same with all prosperous felicity. Amen.” \*

CHAP.  
IX.  
Matthew  
Parker.  
1559-75.

\* Jewel's Works, ed. Parker Soc., p. 109.

## CHAPTER X.

## PREPARATIONS FOR CONVOCATION.

Authority of a Metropolitan.—Powers of Convocation.—Prohibited degrees of marriage.—Lax notion among Protestants on the subject of marriage.—Latin version of the Prayer Book.—Office in behalf of benefactors.—Communion office at funerals.—Re-introduction of the Catholic Calendar, and its reformation.—The Lectionary.—Second Book of Homilies.—The Great Bible.—The Geneva Bible.—Bishops' Bible.—Parker's selection of translators.—Thirty-nine Articles.—Articles as much opposed to ultra-Protestantism as to Popery.

CHAP.  
X.

Matthew  
Parker.

1559-75.

To the approaching Convocation the primate looked forward with considerable anxiety, and he desired to settle by his metropolitan authority, beforehand, some questions which, if left open for discussion, would give rise to angry debates, and to controversies in which he could not calculate with certainty upon obtaining the support of friends whose undoubted wisdom was equalled by a timidity not less indisputable. If among the leading statesmen he had secured a majority in favour of the English principles of Reformation, he had not been successful in enkindling an enthusiasm in his supporters, while his Calvinistic opponents were able, not only to produce among their numbers men of unquestioned and unquestionable learning and piety, but men of erudition whose enthusiasm amounted not unfrequently to fanaticism. He was, like his royal mistress, opposed to the Calvinism which had in this country triumphed over

Lutheranism; but no man can extricate himself entirely from the predominant feelings of the age in which he lives; and we shall find Parker, in his hostility to popery, sometimes the unconscious advocate of ultra-Protestant notions, to which in his deliberate actions he was hostile to the last.

CHAP.  
X.  
Matthew  
Parker.  
1559-75.

Supplemented by the royal prerogative, his powers were unquestionably great, and what they were I shall state in the language of one who, if his logic be not always correct, is scrupulously accurate in his statements of fact.

Powers of  
a metro-  
politan.

The powers of the archbishop, Dr. Cardwell observes, "great in themselves, and still greater when viewed in his high station, as president of a synod, had recently been augmented in the eyes of true churchmen by the rejection of the pope, and the supposed transfer of the most sacred elements of his office to the primate. To aid this impression there was a tradition in the Church, that, in ancient times, he was invested with the authority of a patriarch; and it was a natural consequence, that when the Roman pontiff had been stripped of this, as well as other usurpations, it would revert, whatever might be the amount of it, to its original possessor. In the earlier periods, accordingly, that followed the Reformation, when the conditions of the visible Church were generally understood, and the necessity of a spiritual head to preside over it was distinctly acknowledged, the power of the archbishop was a most effective instrument for Church government."\* This writer refers to the Canons

\* Cardwell, *Synodalia*, xi. xvii. The powers of the metropolitan remain in theory as they were originally; but they have ceased to be exercised. So many among our later primates have suffered themselves to succumb to the civil power, that they have lost much of the moral influence over the minds of the clergy which they did at one time



CHAP.

X.

Matthew  
Parker.

1559-75.

Powers in  
Convoca-  
tion.

of 1571, "upon which it was fully agreed in the Synod by the Lord Matthew, Archbishop of Canterbury, and all the rest of the bishops of his province—that constitutions might be made by the sole authority of the archbishop and his commissioned bishops."

The primate retained for himself, when a Convocation was called, the right of placing a veto on its proceedings; a power which he did not delegate to his *locum tenens*, when, unable to preside personally at a Convocation, he appointed a deputy. He exercised also the sole right to give leave of absence to a member of either house; and as this might easily be obtained where there was a reasonable cause, a neglect of attendance without leave first obtained deprived the offender of any reasonable excuse. It rested with the primate to call for proxies or to refuse them, and to decide upon controverted elections.

The House of Bishops, we are told, uniformly asserted and maintained their superiority over the Lower House. The lower clergy, however, could present petitions containing complaints and suggestions, could offer amendments on the propositions of bishops, or render them of no effect by finally dissenting from them. This disparity, it was affirmed, resulted naturally from the authority possessed by the bishops individually over their respective presbyters, from *the higher* kind of sacredness attaching to their order, which, to the disgust of the non-conforming Puritans, *was one of the constant principles of Elizabeth's conduct.*

possess. The suffragans have gradually assumed an independence which they did not formerly possess, and have become what the ancients called some among their contemporaries, *αὐτοκέφαλοι*. In the United States of America, the senior among the bishops acts as president when the Church assembles in council. Already that important branch of the Church is feeling its way for remedying this defect.

The same author, writing under the influence of the liberal notions of the nineteenth century, but prepared as an archæologist and historian to state the facts of history as he finds them, concludes his preface to the *Synodalia* by reminding his readers, that “the power of a bishop over his clergy is great in itself and in its judicial functions; but it is still greater in their estimation of it, when they think of him and of themselves in their spiritual character; of him as the depositary of sacred influence, and of themselves as under him the ministers and dispensers of it. And if there are any among them with whom such motives make no impression, and the strong arm of the law is the only valid argument, the bishop is supported by the acts of the legislature, and the civil sword is placed in his hands for the punishment of evil-doers. And whatever considerations of the kind apply to any single bishop, they apply with increased effect to the primate, than whom we acknowledge no higher spiritual person upon earth. If then, apart from the wide range of his judicial powers, we suppose him to have taken counsel with his suffragans, and to express his opinion on a question on which any members of the Church have honestly been seeking for it, there can scarcely be desired an authority more conclusive with the parties themselves, or more closely in accordance with the primitive pattern. In a Church indeed—or rather a branch of the Church—united with the State, such opinions are not of the nature of decrees and ordinances, and cannot be enforced by penances and excommunications; but they carry with them a moral and spiritual force which would be decisive to all reasonable minds, and to a Christian temper would be irresistible.” \*

CHAP.  
X.Matthew  
Parker.  
1559-75.\* *Synodalia*, p. xxvii.

CHAP.

X.

Matthew  
Parker.

1559-75.

I have been desirous of placing before the reader the principles which were recognized to their full extent by Archbishop Parker, by Queen Elizabeth, by her great minister Cecil, afterwards Lord Burghley, and, though with less intelligence, by others of her Council. I do this the rather, because, in the course of this narrative, it will be my painful duty to record very frequent deviations from this and from other recognized principles, not only on the part of professed politicians such as the queen and Lord Burghley, but even on the part of Parker himself. For reasons of state, from motives of expediency, with a view to conciliation, great principles were sometimes set aside, although the unhappy individual who should refuse to adhere to them theoretically would be subjected to the higher penalties enacted by the law, of which they were regarded as a foundation. We have thus exhibited various apparent inconsistencies between our theory and our conduct; and we have sometimes to refer to our great English reformers, to ascertain what they said, or what they attempted, rather than what they did.

Before the meeting of Convocation, Archbishop Parker carefully reviewed his position. There were certain principles to be enforced, and rules of conduct to be laid down, which, if brought under discussion before a promiscuous and disunited assembly, would, while provoking debate, be scarcely conducted to an amicable conclusion or a satisfactory arrangement.

Laxity of  
the law of  
marriage.

One subject there was of great importance and peculiar delicacy, upon which it was desirable to avoid a discussion if possible; and by the joint exercise of the temporal and spiritual powers vested in the crown and the mitre, to forestall debate by enactment. The course

Parker pursued did not provoke the opposition which might have been anticipated, from the conviction which prevailed in every class, that the very existence of society was endangered by the lax state of the law of marriage, and the yet greater and more unprincipled laxity in its administration.

CHAP.  
X.  
Matthew  
Parker.  
1559-75.

In the medieval Church the laws relating to matrimony had never been sufficiently stringent; or we ought, perhaps, to describe them as being so stringent as to render the strict observance of them a thing impossible. As regarded the degrees of consanguinity and affinity within which matrimony might be contracted, the prohibitions extended to persons so remotely connected, that it was scarcely possible to avoid a lawsuit, if it became the interest of any persons to dispute the legitimacy of a marriage.

The wealthier classes made security doubly sure by having recourse to dispensations which would cover all objections; and which, in their appetite for fees, the authorities at Rome or their delegates in the provinces were not slow to grant. We have had occasion to show, in the Introductory chapter to this Book, that among the indirect causes of the Reformation in this country, we have to mention the irritating prosecutions carried on or threatened in the lower ecclesiastical courts, which had reference chiefly to an evasion or an ignorance of those laws upon an observance or upon a neglect of which the peace of families might be disturbed.

We are not surprised to learn that, owing to this mystification of the law of marriage, as well as to the depreciation of the holy estate implied in the enforced celibacy of the clergy, a great demoralization of society prevailed. Of this demoralization we have a fearful ac-



CHAP.

X.

Matthew  
Parker.

1559-75.

count in the preamble of a statute introduced in the 25th year of the reign of Henry VIII., with the object in view of providing a remedy for an evil, of which the existence could not be denied. In this preamble there is allusion to "the many inconveniences occasioned by reason of marrying within the degrees prohibited by God's laws; that is to say, the son to marry the mother or stepmother; the brother the sister; the father the son's daughter or his daughter's daughter; or the son to marry the daughter of his father procreate and born by his stepmother; or the son to marry his aunt, being his father's or mother's sister; or to marry his uncle's wife, or any man to marry his wife's daughter, or his wife's daughter's daughter, or his wife's sister."

I have quoted this passage to show the demoralized state of society, as admitted in an authoritative statement made by the legislators of that period. They admitted the evil. They proposed a remedy. But nothing was done. The act proposing measures to meet the evil was soon after repealed.

The case, therefore, came before Parker, thus:—There was a law upon the subject, but the law was in itself so strict, that it was brought under the control of another law, and dispensations for its infraction were easily obtained. But these dispensations, which gave a practical efficacy to the law, were granted on the authority of the Romish courts; and when an application to the court of Rome for a dispensation involved the plaintiff in the penalties of a *præmunire*, such dispensations were not to be obtained, and every one did, as we have just seen, what appeared right in his own eyes, or in accordance with his unrestrained passion.

Among the continental reformers, very loose notions on the subject of matrimony prevailed; as Parker must have

Loose  
notions of  
matrimony  
among the  
Protes-  
tants.

been made aware in the conversations he held with his friend Martin Bucer, for Bucer had borne a part, and not a very reputable part, in the controversies on this subject, in which his friends Luther, Melancthon, and other Protestants were involved. Luther, Melancthon, and other reformers of that school, including Bucer himself, had even gone to the length of admitting, that polygamy, under certain circumstances, might be regarded as lawful; and they seemed to have been only restrained from asserting their opinion by an intuitive perception, that it would shock the public opinion of Europe, and strengthen the hands of their opponents.

To a certain extent they came to the same conclusion, or nearly so, with the Romanists. In a celebrated cause they were hard pressed to permit a German prince to marry a second wife while his first wife was still living: it was asserted, that the law of God did not prohibit polygamy; the prohibition resting, not on divine command, but on human law. It was argued, that what was enacted by man might be by man repealed: so that the question was, not merely whether a dispensation might be granted, but simply, from whom the dispensation was to emanate. The Romanists said from the pope, the Protestants from the Emperor.\*

CHAP.

X.

Matthew  
Parker.

1559-75.

\* The learned reader will understand that I am alluding to the case of Philip Landgrave of Hesse, a case which reflects disgrace upon all who were concerned in it. The Landgrave was himself a coarse, vulgar, bloated Sybarite, and in language the more offensive from the fact that he did not himself perceive the offensiveness of it, he demanded of the German reformers permission to take unto himself a second wife—because he had ceased to regard his first wife with affection, though she was still living, and had been the mother of many children. He employed Martin Bucer to negotiate with Luther, Melancthon, and other great foreign reformers on the subject. His patronage and protection they could retain on no other terms. His plea is almost comical.

CHAP.

X.

Matthew  
Parker.

1559-75.

To this case and to these circumstances allusion is made, in order that the reader may clearly understand the extreme difficulties of the case, through sophistry and argument, and laxity in morals, when Parker was required to legislate. One thing was certain, the time had come when something must be done. The controversial temper with which the question had been met, was such as to render it advisable not to submit it to a discussion in parliament or in Convocation. There was, however, sufficient authority, as we have already pointed out, to create and enforce a law upon the subject; and the archbishop saw his way. The political difficulties which the continental reformers had to meet were not in the way of Parker. His opponents were the Puritans. Churchmen were ready to support him when he laid down the law, provided that he did not run counter to Scripture and the primitive Church. Puritans, on the other hand, cared nothing for his metropolitan authority; they must have the Bible, and the Bible only. When reference was made to the Bible, the New Testament was silent upon the subject; but the Puritans accepted the Old Testament as the word of God; and by this authority, although the

He ought to set an example to his people to receive the Lord's Supper; but he could not receive the Lord's Supper if he was living in open violation of the laws of morality—therefore the laws of morality should be changed, at all events, so far as he was concerned. He quotes in favour of polygamy the fathers of the Old Testament, and he states undoubtedly that both Luther and Melancthon had advised Henry VIII. not to put away his wife Queen Katharine, but to make Anne Boleyn also his wife. The Landgrave threatened, if the reformers would not accede to his wishes, to seek through the Emperor a dispensation from the pope, though his hatred of the pope was unabated. Luther, Melancthon, Bucer, and others, in an able document, refuted the arguments of the Landgrave; but they concluded, if they could not persuade him to be contented with one wife, by promising him a dispensation, on the condition that he should keep his second wife a secret.

Mosaic law is no longer in force, Archbishop Parker proposed to be ruled.

Considered abstractedly, this was not the wisest course that could have been pursued; but under the given circumstances it is difficult to surmise a safer mode of proceeding; and it must be admitted that fewer difficulties have resulted from Parker's legislation than lawyers were, at one time, inclined to anticipate and predict. The archbishop professed to adapt to the exigences of the existing Church the scriptural principles as laid down in the eighteenth and twentieth chapters of Leviticus. He assumed that the degrees which are laid down as to men will hold equally as to women in the same proximity; that the husband and wife being but one flesh, he who is related to the one by consanguinity is related to the other by affinity in the same degree.

The table, when drawn up, was issued by the sole authority of the archbishop. It has been slightly altered by subsequent legislation, but remains, substantially, to the present time, the law of the Church and realm. Parker published contemporaneously, "An Admonition for the Present Time, with a still further Consultation of all such as intend hereafter to enter into the Estate of Matrimony godly and agreeable to Law." \*

\* The case of marrying a wife's sister has occasioned some dispute, although, as Bishop Jewel observed, if we are forbidden to marry a brother's wife, it follows that we are forbidden to marry a wife's sister: "For between one man and two sisters, and one woman and two brothers, is the like an analogy or proportion." Such marriages, however, not being void *ab initio*, but voidable only by order of separation to be made in an Ecclesiastical Court, they were esteemed valid to all civil purposes, unless separation was actually made during the life of the parties. Such was the law until the year 1835, when an act was passed, which, after legalizing certain former marriages, enacted that all marriages that shou'd hereafter be celebrated between



CHAP.  
X.Matthew  
Parker.  
1559-75.

This admonition was duly printed, and an order was given for its being set up in every church. A copy is preserved in the library of Corpus Christi College, Cambridge, with the archbishop's marks of revision made by his well-known red pencil ; and it exists as a perpetual monument of his industry and caution.

Latin  
Prayer  
Book.

The performance of Divine Service in the Latin language having been permitted in the chapels of the universities and of the two great public schools of Winchester and Eton, it became necessary to prepare and authorize a Latin version of the Liturgy and other offices of the Church. Of the first Prayer Book of Edward a translation was in existence, and instead of making a version of the "Use" which had just been accepted by parliament and embodied in the Act of Uniformity, the archbishop determined on a revision of the existing Latin Prayer Book, and he intrusted the work to one of the learned men of the day most competent for the task, Walter Haddon. The former translation had been made by Alexander Aless, a canon regular of St. Andrew's, in Scotland, of whom notice has been taken in the life of Cranmer. It was not the work of an accomplished scholar, and if Haddon, a man of learning as well as a divine, had wished to save himself trouble, he would have found it easier to make an entirely new translation than to revise the old one ; but this was not what his employers desired.

The object of the archbishop and his associates was to give a quasi-authority to the first Book of King Edward. Although, by the Act of Uniformity, another "Use" had been adopted for the public services of the Church, yet

persons within the prohibited degrees of consanguinity and affinity should be "absolutely null and void to all intents and purposes whatsoever."

no valid objection could be produced against the contemporaneous use of the first Prayer Book by learned men. The queen and her advisers would have established that Book, but yielded, as an act of policy, to the Puritans, who complained that practices were there enjoined which might generate superstition in the minds of the uneducated ; but the Prayer Book itself they could not venture to decry, because by this Church and realm it had been accepted as the inspired work of God the Holy Ghost ; and the objection before noticed would not be applicable to the men of learning for whom alone the Latin version was designed.

The Church had been long accustomed to various "Uses," or different Prayer Books, of which it could be said with reference to each,

*Facies non omnibus una  
Nec diversa tamen, quales decet esse sororum ;*

and consequently there was no reason why there should not be one "Use" for the parishes, and another for the Universities. The archbishop went further. The clergy were required to repeat daily the matins and the even-song. If this were done in the congregation, they were under an obligation to use the new Prayer Book ; but if there were no congregation, then, in repeating the offices, they were authorized to use the Latin form to which they had been accustomed, when pursuing their early studies at school or college.

Parker and the English reformers, though to the last approving of the revision of the Prayer Book, published in the first instance on their own authority, regretted, nevertheless, the omission of certain Catholic practices, upon which, in their superstitious dread of superstition, their Puritan coadjutors had insisted. And knowing the

CHAP.  
X.

Matthew  
Parker.

1559-75.

CHAP.  
X.

Matthew  
Parker.

1559-75.

truth involved in the saying, *legem credendi lex statuat supplicandi*, they seized the present opportunity, not to supersede the last Prayer Book, but to attach also a quasi-authority to the first Book of Edward VI.\*

Prayer for  
benefac-  
tors.

On the same principle Parker introduced a formulary, in which our communion with holy ones departed appears to be recognized. Prayers and thanksgivings continued to be offered in the colleges, in grateful recollection of founders and benefactors; but since the Reformation no particular form had been prescribed. Recourse, under these circumstances, was had to the ancient forms, objectionable on account of their reference to purgatory; while the Puritans were not without hope that the office would be discontinued. Parker adopted the middle course, and gave to the Universities a reformed formulary, under the title of *In Commendationibus Benefactorum*.

Communion for  
the dead.

The Latin Prayer Book contained also a *Celebratio cœnæ Domini in funeribus, si amici et vicini defuncti communicare velint*.

Other works were also sanctioned by Archbishop Parker, and were issued by his authority as the metropolitan, with the *imprimatur* of the sovereign; namely, a Primer or Orarium, and a Latin Book of Devotions: *Preces Privatæ in Studiosorum gratiam collectæ*.

The English Prayer Book had been remodelled to meet the demands of the middle class—a class now indulging in theological discussion without sufficient learning to arrive always at a right conclusion. The Latin works were an appeal to the more learned, in the hope that, if further alterations should be required (and that such

\* By modern writers surprise is expressed at Haddon's contenting himself with correcting an imperfect version of the Prayer Book, and he is accused of indolence or carelessness. He is acquitted, however, when the circumstances mentioned above are taken into consideration.

would be the case there was little doubt), the alterations would take a Catholic direction, and not be a concession to ultra-Protestant prejudices.

CHAP.

X.

Matthew  
Parker.

1559-75.

To avoid any discussion in Convocation on these and similar topics was assuredly a wise and politic measure. There was also connected with the Latin Prayer Book another subject which Parker had much at heart, and in carrying which he might have anticipated a strong opposition. In the Latin Prayer Book the Calendar re-appeared.

Restora-  
tion of the  
Catholic  
Calendar.

In the Calendar in 1549, the only days appointed for observance were what are described as Red Letter days, to which are appointed certain collects, epistles, and gospels. In 1552, the names of St. George, St. Lawrence, and St. Clement were added; and, by a mistake, probably, the name of St. Mary Magdalene was omitted. The English Calendar of 1559 had no Black Letter days, except the festivals of St. Lawrence and St. George; but in the Latin Prayer Book the name of some saint is attached to almost every day.

This was probably intended as a feeler, and the archbishop prepared to introduce a reformed Calendar into the English Prayer Book. To effect his purpose three courses were open to him: he might bring the subject before Convocation; he might make the order by his own authority; or, by reference to a statute passed in the last parliament, he might call upon the queen to appoint a Commission. By not consulting Convocation, he avoided a party battle; and he hoped, by uniting the metropolitan with the royal authority, to silence all gainsayers. To those who would regard the royal interference as an Erastian movement, he could present his mandate as, archbishop; and if there were any who cared little for his spiritual authority, he could urge upon them the royal



CHAP.

X.

Matthew  
Parker.

1559-75.

injunction. He determined, therefore, to ask for a Commission, at the head of which he took his place; and thus he established a precedent, the consequence of which was most pernicious. The crown exercised from this time extraordinary power, for the misuse of which the hierarchy had to bear the blame.

Revision  
of the  
Lection-  
ary.

The apparent object of the Commission was to establish a Lectionary, for which a demand was made by the Puritans; but the formation of a Lectionary was certainly not the primary intention of Parker when he suggested the Commission. It is true, that some changes were made in the selection of proper lessons for Sundays and Holydays, yet they were so few, and of such little significance, that we may doubt whether any one would have complained, if the metropolitan and his suffragans had taken it upon themselves to make the necessary alterations. The powers of the Commission were more extensive, and it was for the exercise of those extraordinary powers that it was called into existence.

Royal  
Commis-  
sion.

The Commission was addressed to the archbishop himself, to the Bishop of London, to William Bill, the queen's almoner, and Walter Haddon, one of the Masters in Chancery, of whom notice has just been taken. It was thus entirely under the control and direction of the archbishop, both Bill and Haddon agreeing with him in all the great principles of action; and the Bishop of London, who could scarcely be passed by, though inclined to the Puritans, and regarded as their representative in the Commission, was not a man to offer unnecessary opposition to the primate.

The Commissioners were directed to make such changes in the Lectionary as they might think conducive to the greater edification of the people.

Remarks being made on the neglected state of the

churches and chapels, and especially of the chancels, it was observed that this neglect was the more disgraceful when compared with the expensive care exhibited by all classes of the community upon their private houses. The queen, in consequence, directed the Commissioners to take steps for counteracting the evil complained of. Among other things, they were required "to order that the Tables of the Ten Commandments might be comely set up, or hung up at the east end of the church, to be not only read for edification, but also to give some *comely ornament and demonstration* that the same is a place of religion and prayer."

CHAP.

X.

Matthew  
Parker.

1559-75.

In this injunction we find perhaps an excuse for the Commission. The chancels and churches were chiefly those which had been formerly repaired at the expense of the monasteries; when the monasteries were destroyed, and the property passed into lay hands, the parties purchasing the rights of the former possessors succeeded to their responsibilities, and if they neglected duties while they availed themselves of the advantages of their position, they were justly amenable to censure. Of these offenders, it was to be feared that the majority would not have amended their ways on a mere remonstrance from the archbishop, and it was important, therefore, to support the remonstrance by a royal command. Even this, however, did not meet the evil to its full extent, because, although the repairs of the chancels devolved on the lay rector, the expense of keeping the church in order was incurred by the parishioners.

The archbishop received the royal mandate on the 22nd of January, and on the 15th of February he issued a pastoral address to his suffragans, through the Bishop of London. While the prelates were engaged in carrying into effect the directions of their metropolitan, the arch-

Publica-  
tion of the  
new Cal-  
endar and  
Lectionary.

CHAP.  
X.

Matthew  
Parker.  
1559-75.

bishop was himself employed in reforming the Calendar, a duty in his mind closely connected with the establishment of a Lectionary, the character of the lessons being dependent, in a certain measure, upon the festival or fast-day, for which the perusal of them was appointed.

The main object of Parker and of the queen was to exhibit the connection of the existing Church, which they were reforming, with the Catholic Church of former times, of which it was not the successor, but a development. The holy men of old were to be revered for their godliness, even though they held some doctrines which were now repudiated; and performed certain acts of devotion which the present Church no longer observed. Two men may not be on speaking terms with one another at the present time, and yet they may be members of the same family. In the United States of America, we often find a man, who prefers his republican to our monarchical institutions, and yet claims a kind of family share in the minds and homes of Englishmen who flourished before the separation of the North American colonies from the mother country. In these remarks we find an explanation of Parker's feelings, and of those which are still predominant in the Anglo-Catholic mind. In the hagiography of the Church there are presented to us examples of peculiar excellence achieved under the most difficult and trying circumstances, and the study of the lives of such heroes would, in Parker's judgment, be conducive to the spiritual advancement of men who are influenced by example more than by precept.

To a revival of the Calendar, opposition was sometimes offered by the statesman as well as by the Puritan, and, to a certain point, with justice. As the world became busy, and enterprise was encouraged among the commercial men of England, the observance of the many

holydays which existed before the Reformation was felt to be a grievance—it encouraged idleness, and promoted in many instances that licentiousness which is of idleness the invariable consequence. The evil might be corrected by correcting the abuse, which consisted in the useless multiplying of those days. That the Church was right in demanding leisure for the working population is proved by what we witness in these days, when for worldly enjoyment the working classes are insisting upon the concession, on the part of their employers, of more days for recreation and fewer hours for actual labour.

Parker admitted the grievance, and was quite ready to diminish the number of idle days by only requiring the absolute observance of the Red Letter days. But for those who possessed the leisure, he provided study and employment by retaining some, at least, of the Black Letter days.\*

That he failed in sustaining an observance of these days among the great body of the Church may be regretted, but cannot be denied. For a long period they were observed in all the public courts and proceedings of the nation; and, at all events, it was a fair experiment to be made; one of the experiments designed to resist the sectarian tendency of the Puritans, who thought that no man was religious before the coming of Calvin, and who anathematized all except those in whom latent Calvinism might at least be detected or supposed.

From the earliest period of the Church's history, Calendars have existed; they may be dated from the martyr-

CHAP.  
X.

Matthew  
Parker.

1559-75.

\* In pity for the laborious, the primitive Church established holidays; by the multiplication of which the medieval Church erred; by an almost entire renunciation of them the error of Protestantism has been still greater. It is a circumstance worthy of notice, that Plato regarded the appointment of holidays as divine: *θεοὶ δὲ οἰκτεῖραντες τὴ τῶν ἀνθρώπων ἐπιπορον πεφυκὸς γένος ἀναπαύλαι τε αὐτοῖς τῶν πόρων ἐτάξαντο τὰς τῶν ἑορτῶν ἀμοιβὰς τοῖς θεοῖς.*—Leg. ii. 1.



CHAP.

X.

Matthew  
Parker.

1559-75.

dom of St. Polycarp in the year 168. We have them in the Diptychs of the primitive Church. When the Diptychs developed into the modern Calendar, we perceive the Calendar to consist of a table in which are stated days, and weeks, and months, with the fasts and festivals of the Church.

Calendars. The Jesuit Boucher, in his commentary on the Paschal Cycle, gives a Calendar which bears the date of A.D. 336. This is, I believe, the earliest Calendar that has been printed.\* Another Calendar of the Church of Carthage, bearing date A.D. 483, is to be found in Mabillon's "Analecta." In our own Church the Calendar was largely illustrated by the Venerable Bede, in the eighth century. To this Calendar the names of saints were added from time to time, at the option, it would appear, at first, of the several diocesans, until the pope reserved to himself the right of canonization. To the latter circumstance we may attribute the fact, that for two hundred years before the accession of Henry VIII. the English Calendar had remained stationary. In the year 1536, that king issued his injunctions to restrict the number of holydays, a complaint having been made that they had become so numerous as to encourage idleness and interfere with business. It is said in the proclamation, that scarcely sufficient men were left of the agricultural population to gather in the harvest; though the real complainants were the merchants and men of commerce. The injunction was issued in the king's name, with the assent and consent of the prelates and clergy assembled in Convocation. The alterations were of a practical nature, and as few as was consistent with the purposes of the injunction. The feasts which fell at the harvest time or in term time, were discharged, so that

\* Boucher's Commentary was published at Antwerp, A.D. 1634.

every man was at liberty, at his own discretion, to work or refrain from working. To the state of things as they existed in King Henry's reign, Parker and the queen desired to restore the Calendar.

CHAP.

X.

Matthew  
Parker.

1559-75.

In considering the names of saints to be retained in the Calendar, and whom to omit, Archbishop Parker did not possess the assistance from books which a modern scholar can command. The "*Acta Sanctorum*" were not as yet in existence, and there was no Bollandist to consult. Between the death of Parker and the birth of John von Bolland, more than twenty years were to elapse. Even the very learned precursor of his yet more learned labours, Herbert Rosweyd, was only two years old when Archbishop Parker breathed his last. Parker had before him, it is true, the hagiologies of Surius and Lippomanni, but so full of errors were these volumes, that a portion of the labours of the lenient Bollandists consisted in the correction of their fables.\*

The conjecture that the adoption of a corrected Calendar was the first object with the archbishop and the queen, and that in establishing it they did not think it expedient to provoke opposition more than was necessary, is confirmed by the injunction given to the Commissioners,

\* It is said of Bollandus, that he laboured on the *Acta Sanctorum* for thirty-four years; and to the same work fifty-five years were devoted by Daniel Papebrock. The work, which is not yet completed, must be regarded among the wonders of literature. It is of course of unequal merit. We have occasionally to pass from an instructor, at whose feet the highest intellect would be proud to sit, to marvel at the absurdities of a writer inferior as a critic and offensive in his credulous superstition. The names of the distinguished men who began the work are to be found in the following lines—

Quod Rosweyodus prepararat,  
Quod Bollandus inchoarat,  
Quod Henscheinus formarat,  
Perfecit Papebrochius.

CHAP.  
X.

Matthew  
Parker.

1559-75.

to proceed with as little noise as possible. The Commissioners did not venture to insert in the English Prayer Book all the names that appeared in the Latin version.

The moderation of the English reformers was shown in this transaction. No one was compelled to observe the Black Letter days; although for those who find pleasure in celebrating the triumphs of grace over fallen human nature, the Calendar was convenient as a table of reference; and if they were accused of superstition for doing in the church what many do in private families, when they have days set apart to commemorate great blessings, or to humble themselves for deep domestic sorrow, the archbishop might quote the authority of Scripture: "One esteemeth one day above another, another esteemeth every day alike. Let every man be fully persuaded in his own mind."

Lay help.

While thus acting on his own authority, assisted by the powers of the crown, in matters that he did not think it expedient to bring before Convocation, the archbishop was, at the same time, preparing subjects for the discussion of the synod. It will be remembered that, in order to meet the exigencies of the Church, when candidates for orders were few, or when those who aspired to the clerical offices proved upon examination to be incompetent to discharge the duties pertaining thereto, the archbishop had instituted an order of lecturers, readers, or lay helpers.\* Their duties were clearly defined; and while they were excluded, of course, from the discharge of sacerdotal functions, or the ministration of the Sacraments, while they were not even permitted to preach, they were required to read certain Homilies to the people, and complaint was made that the Homilies were so few that the

\* Strype, Annals, I. i. 315.

repetition of them, in many cases, became wearisome. To provide fresh Homilies would thus become the business of the next Convocation.

Twelve Homilies had been published by authority in 1547, and, with the exception of the five years of Queen Mary's reign, had been very generally used, not only by the lay helpers, but also by the non-preaching clergy. They were composed upon a principle, which, from the time when he first began to give his mind to theological studies, had commended itself to the judgment of Archbishop Parker. In the Homilies the old Catholic doctrines were maintained, and they are stated with a fullness which surprised those who, a few years since, found them circulated and quoted as authoritative by the Puritans of the present age. They must have been circulated by many who had not taken the trouble to peruse them, but were carried away by a reference to a few passages which savour of Protestantism. For instance, in the Homilies we find maintained the great doctrine of justification by faith only; a doctrine which, true in one sense, is not inconsistent with the doctrine of justification by works, which is true in another sense. The object of those who hold the doctrine of justification by faith is to induce men to rely for salvation from first to last on the merits of the Saviour; and on this account it was received by Cardinal Pole, and by some others as resolute as he was in maintaining the papal hierarchy, until they were deprived of their liberty of thought in that direction by the Council of Trent. The leading members of that synod discovered what had previously been maintained by Luther, viz., that, where the doctrine of justification by faith is held, there no place can be found for works of supererogation, with the renunciation of which tenet almost all that is objectionable in Neo-Romanism falls to the ground.

CHAP.  
X.

Matthew  
Parker.

1559-75.

The  
Homilies.



CHAP.  
X.Matthew  
Parker.

1559-75.

Deference  
to the  
Fathers by  
the writers  
of the  
Homilies.

The writers of the Homilies held the doctrine of justification by faith only, but they also held, as consistent with this dogma, a belief in the authoritative teaching and sacred tradition of the primitive Church, regarded not as co-ordinate in authority with the holy Scripture, but as explanatory of the same. In the Homilies we find enforced a deference to the first four general councils, and the sacramental character of several ordinances of the Church, besides baptism and the Holy Eucharist. The actual title of a Sacrament, for example, is given to Matrimony, but then, it is to be remembered, that this was done by persons who made a broad distinction between all other means of grace, and the two distinguishing ordinances of the Catholic Church—Baptism, and the Supper of the Lord. The two ordinances last named are not only means of grace; they are means of the *special* grace of uniting the souls of the faithful to the Redeemer.\* The Homilies teach regeneration in holy baptism, the Real Presence in the Eucharist, and the inspiration of the Apocrypha, though in a sense, of course, different from that in which the term *inspiration* is applied to the canonical Scriptures. This was all in accordance with the views of Archbishop Parker, whose principles were embodied in the decree *De Concinnatoribus*, passed in the Convocation of 1571. This canon contains rules for the guidance of all preachers of the Church of England. The words are as follows:—

\* The Reformers refused generally the title of Sacraments to many important ordinances, because they were jealous of the dignity of Baptism and the Supper of the Lord: a modern Puritan would denounce, in words of flame, any one who should speak of seven Sacraments; but one can scarcely guess why. They do not regard Baptism and the Lord's Supper as special means of grace, or means of grace at all. The dispute about the number of the Sacraments is mere logomachy, and therefore a sin.

“In the first place, they [the preachers] shall see that they never teach anything for a discourse which they wish to be religiously held and believed by the people, but what is agreeable to the doctrine of the Old and New Testament, and what the Catholic fathers and ancient bishops have collected out of that same doctrine.” It has been suggested, that if there be one feature throughout the whole of the Homilies more remarkable than another, it is the exhibition of a principle of deference to the ancient Church. In a moderate-sized volume, the archbishop found the names of Anselm, Athanasius, Arnobius, Augustine, Basil, Bede, Bernard, Chrysostom, Clemens, Cyprian, Cyril, Epiphanius, Eusebius, Fulgentius, Gregory, Hilary, Ignatius, Irenæus, Jerome, Isidore, Justin, Lactantius, Origen, Optatus, Theophylact, Tertullian, and others whom I have passed over for want of space. That the writers must have been well versed in patristic learning we shall be the more easily persuaded, when we add, that these were not mere partial allusions to the old writers, but sometimes they were citations from their works. There are enumerated, indeed, not fewer than forty citations from the works of St. Augustine; and the fathers thus quoted are spoken of in terms of profound respect; such as, “The great clerk and godly preacher;” “the learned and godly doctors;” “the holy fathers and doctors;” “you see that the authority both of Scripture and also of Augustine;” “it is already proved both by the authority of Scripture and by the authority of Augustine;” “ye have heard how earnestly both the apostles, prophets, holy fathers, and doctors do exhort us;” “but before all things,” it is said in one place where there is reference to the Eucharist, “this we must be sure of especially, that this supper be in suchwise done and ministered as our Lord and Saviour did and commanded

CHAP.

X.

Matthew  
Parker.

1559-75.

CHAP.  
X.

Matthew  
Parker.

1559-75.

to be done, as his apostles used it, and the *good fathers* of the primitive Church frequented it."

Parker desired to be regarded as both Protestant and Catholic, for he regarded the title of Protestant as being opposed, not to Catholicism, but to Romanism. Opposed to papists such as Bonner, Sanders, and Allen, he took his place among the Anglo-Catholics, and with them he endeavoured to conciliate the reformers on either side, and to form a great Protestant school. He was glad to bring into combined action, the "new learning" and "the old;" and he was well pleased in the Homily of Matrimony to point to half of it as the work of St. Chrysostom, and to the other half as that of Veit Dietrich of Nuremburg. He was always very careful also to avoid any approach to the sectarian system, or to attach importance to the *ipse dixit* of the theological hero of the day whoever he might be. He desired to have the Homilies regarded simply as lessons for the accuracy of which individuals were responsible; while by himself and his synod they were pronounced to be, on the whole, satisfactory productions peculiarly suited to the exigency of the times. In studying them we are never to forget that the Homilies now published were designed, not to make known what Luther opined or Calvin asserted, but simply to inform the people what the Church has received from our ancestors, and would hand on to posterity.

The Homilies were accepted by Convocation; and the archbishop, as it may be seen in his correspondence, was particularly anxious for their immediate circulation. For that very reason, perhaps, he found an unaccountable obstacle at court. The queen, in spite of the urgency of the primate and of Cecil, delayed her sanction of the publication, instigated by Robert Dudley, afterwards Earl of Leicester, the bitter enemy of the archbishop.

Although one of the basest of mankind, Leicester was the aider and abettor of the Puritans, being united to them by a common object of hatred—the Church: they, under the influence of pious though mistaken principles; he, because he hoped, through their means, to obtain a further share of the plundered Establishment.\*

We may here mention another important work to which the archbishop began now to turn his mind, although he did not complete his undertaking for several years afterwards. The grand idea of an authorized version of Scripture began to dawn in his mind, and at last he came to the conclusion that, if the teaching of the Church was to become what it professed to be—scriptural, such a version would be absolutely necessary. His principle was to state what the Church had received; to place the Bible in the hands of the children of the Church; and then to call upon them, if doubts were raised against the Church's teaching by Puritans, Anabaptists, or others, to search the Scriptures, like the good Bereans of old, to see whether these things were so.

Of the several versions of Scripture which had succeeded each other, through the zeal of party, commercial speculation, or the piety of individuals, since the middle of King Henry's reign, we have had occasion already to speak. They were all of them meritorious; and, considering the disadvantageous circumstances under which the translations had been made, they are very remarkable works. But their defects were also great, and these defects became the more apparent as men advanced in the critical study of the original Scriptures.

In the reign of Edward VI., "the Great Bible" was,

\* When this remark is made, we must acquit the Puritans of blame, and remember that when he died, Leicester was probably not regarded as more profligate than others in the Court.

CHAP.

X.

Matthew  
Parker.

1559-75.

New  
version of  
Scripture  
projected.

Geneva  
Bible.

The Great  
Bible.  
1539-40.



## CHAP.

## X.

Matthew  
Parker.

1559-75.

to all intents and purposes, the authorized version, for it was ordered that with this Bible every church should be supplied.

Although opinions are divided on the merits of this translation, the majority, perhaps, of impartial critics, competent to form a judgment on the subject, will admit that it was an improvement upon its predecessors. It was published in 1539, and although it is frequently called "Cranmer's Bible," there is no evidence to show that Cranmer had any share in its preparation, and his vacillating mind was not always consulted by the unscrupulous minister of Henry VIII.\*

It was a speculation of Crumwell's, and would probably have been called "Crumwell's Bible," if that minister's death had not followed almost immediately upon its publication; when, to mention his name was almost tantamount, in the royal ear, to the utterance of treason. Cranmer, however, made it his own, in one sense, by prefixing some prologues, or, as we should call them, prefaces to it, and causing a re-issue to take place in 1540.

Although we are not among those who would unduly depreciate this meritorious work, yet it cannot be denied, that it had many and great defects. Among its faults may be reckoned too great a deference to the Vulgate, from which, rather than from the original Scriptures, the version was made. It may have appeared to the writers that more authority attached to a version which had been accepted by all the European Churches, than could be claimed for any translation for which only two or three learned men were responsible; but it was forgotten, that of the Vulgate itself no critical edition had as yet been published; that it had not been revised,

\* Westcott, p. 100. It was called "The Great Bible" from its size; large folio.

and that undetected errors had been for ages creeping into it—a fact tacitly admitted by the Council of Trent.

When, on the accession of Mary, some of the most learned of our divines, in distrust of their courage to endure the fiery trial prepared for them, fled the country, some there were, especially after the troubles at Frankfort, who made Geneva their home. Being possessed of leisure for study, they determined to devote their time to a new and more complete translation of the sacred Scriptures into the English language.

Their residence in Geneva was advantageous to them, as it introduced them to some of the most erudite scholars of the age; but the advantage was counterbalanced by their being brought into subjection to the master mind of John Calvin; and by their embracing, through him, the most narrow and sectarian system of theology that has ever involved the world in the most bitter controversies and the most angry disputes.

The refugees at Geneva and Zurich possessed in Calvin and Beza assistants whose scholarship was, in that age, unsurpassed, and whose minds were occupied in similar pursuits; for a critical revision of the French and Italian versions was now engaging their attention. Our countrymen became also acquainted with Robert Stephens, the celebrated printer, to whom, more than to any other contemporary, the biblical student was indebted.

They were brought into intimacy with John Calvin through William Whittingham, who had married his sister. The brother-in-law of Calvin, though narrow-minded and bigoted, was nevertheless a man of mark. Of a good family, he had been educated at Oxford, and had visited, for the purposes of study, several of the continental universities. He took an active part in the new version of the Scriptures, and when Whittingham's New

CHAP.  
X.

Matthew  
Parker.

1559-75.

CHAP.

X.

Matthew  
Parker.

1559-75.

Testament appeared in 1557, it was received not only with the applause of Puritans animated by party spirit, but with the grateful approbation of others, to whom a scholarly translation in a portable volume was of unspeakable value. The New Testament was followed by a version of the whole of the Old Testament; which, however, did not make its appearance until the year 1560. The New Testament, translated by Whittingham, formed part of the Geneva Bible; and the better part, since it is evident, that the same amount of industry was not bestowed upon the Old Testament as had rendered the translation of the New Testament so superior as to elicit the praise of all parties competent to form a judgment on the subject.

The intrinsic merits of the edition now published were great. It was printed as a small quarto volume; in Roman type, not, as the other editions, in black-letter; and it was divided, not only into chapters, but also into verses. Preceding versions had been printed much after the manner of our modern paragraph Bibles. Frequent maps and tables were added, and whatever could assist or interest the ordinary reader.\*

I have given an account of this Bible, because its merits

\* Our chapter divisions date from the 12th century. The division by verses was introduced in a margin of the Greek Testament by the learned printer Stephens, in the year 1551. Our great authority for our English versions of Scripture, and indeed for all that pertains to the publication of the sacred volume, is Canon Westcott. He refers to and corrects Anderson, whose learned work is ill arranged; and he gives just praise to the interesting historical account prefixed to Bagster's Hexapla, which, though requiring revision, is unduly depreciated by Anderson. Canon Westcott raises an indignant protest against such party writers as Mr. Hallam and his followers, whom he accuses of "misrepresenting every significant feature in an important episode of literary history." See also Cotton's List of Bibles; Lewis's History of Translations, pp. 257-308; Neal's Puritans, i. 110; Collier, vi. 414.

CHAP.

X.

Matthew

Parker.

1559-75.

were so conspicuous and its faults so occult that, when first it appeared, it received the sanction of the archbishop for its circulation, and the patronage of the queen. It was published by subscription, but the greater part of the expense was incurred by John Bodley, the father of that distinguished man, by whom, as the founder of the Bodleian Library, the name is immortalized.

Bodley advanced his money chiefly as a commercial speculation, or certainly as a good speculation he turned it to account on the accession of Queen Elizabeth. In 1560, he obtained a special licence for the sole printing of the Geneva Bible, and the monopoly was to continue for seven years, dating from the 8th of January, 1560. In the year 1565, he obtained a renewal of the monopoly, against the opinion of the queen and Cecil, but at the solicitation of Parker, who united with the Bishop of London in recommending the licence for which Bodley petitioned.

It is difficult to understand Parker's object in thus uniting with the Puritan party, unless it was to court popularity and to disarm hostility against a Church version which he was already projecting, and in which he had made some advance. That version would not have been undertaken if Parker had been satisfied with the Genevan version; but it is evident, that when he subjected that work to a critical examination, he found more cause to be discontented with it. It is sometimes said, that the Calvinism in the notes to the Geneva Bible is mild; but this must be said by those who have never examined the book. Neal, a friendly critic and historian, informs us, that a dedication and epistle to the reader, which appeared in the first edition, were afterwards omitted. Parker was often culpably easy in extending his patronage to literary works without examining them, and this may



CHAP.  
X.

Matthew  
Parker.

1559-75.

account for the appearance of the dedication and epistle in the first edition, while the omission of these prefaces in subsequent editions is their condemnation. Neal honestly admits, that they were withdrawn "because they touched somewhat severely upon certain ceremonies retained in the Church of England, which they excited her majesty to remove, as having a popish aspect; and because the translators had published notes which were thought to affect the queen's prerogative." In the note on Revelation ix. 3—that we may show the *animus* of the men—we remark that: "The locusts that come out of the smoke are said to be like subtle prelates, with monks, friars, cardinals, patriarchs, archbishops, bishops," &c.\*

The queen and Cecil may have continued the monopoly of John Bodley; but this fact is doubtful, while it is certain, that during the period of Parker's episcopate the sale of the Geneva Bible decreased, reviving immediately on Grindal's translation from the see of York to be his successor.

Bishops'  
Bible,  
1563-68.

We need not pursue this subject further. What was the opinion of Parker and of the English reformers on the character of the Geneva Bible, and the mischievous tendency of its notes, is sufficiently proved by the zeal with which the archbishop engaged upon a translation, designed to be an authorized version to be used in every church.

\* See Anderson's Annals, ii. 524. Strype, i. 413. Neal, i. 110. Neal explicitly asserts that the petition for a removal of the monopoly in 1563 was refused, and the impression stopped till after the death of Archbishop Parker. Cardwell, in his Documentary Annals, ii. 31 adds, that King James perused the Geneva Bible, and pronounced it to be "very partial, untrue, seditious, and savouring too much of dangerous and traitorous conceits." See also Cotton's List of Bibles Lewis's Hist. of Translations, p. 257. Strype's Whitgift, ii. 28 Barton's Conference, p. 43. Newcome's Hist. of Translations, p. 68 Todd's Vindic. App. No. 3. Wood's Ann. ii. 313.

His Bible was to embody the improvements of the Genevan translation, to represent the advanced state of biblical literature, and to avoid that spirit of party which he refused at all times to patronize.

CHAP.  
X.  
Matthew  
Parker.  
1559-75.

In referring to this subject I have rather anticipated the history of events, because it appears to be convenient to place the whole subject before the reader from one point of view. We do, indeed, only remark very slightly, if at all, upon the fourteen translators; for, although the Bishops' Bible was not commenced before the year 1563, while more than four years were required for its completion, Parker was employed during the preceding years in collecting materials for the work, and making his selection of men.

It is indeed creditable to the government, and to Parker as its ecclesiastical adviser, that in looking out for learned men to co-operate with him in this important undertaking, his selection of coadjutors was made largely from the episcopal bench. The fact of their being chosen when scholarship was the sole or the prominent qualification, is a proof that the ecclesiastical appointments were made, not at the solicitation of private interest—though this was sometimes the case—but from a regard to the learning and piety of the persons preferred. This conduct is the more praiseworthy, when we observe that, if the ecclesiastics chosen were not active in their opposition to the measures of the queen and the primate, there were many among them who gave but a cold support to their superiors, and who did not hesitate to make it known, that while they obeyed, there were many points on which they could have wished that obedience should not be required.

The archbishop assigned certain sections or “parcels” of the sacred volume to be perused by certain scholars

Parker's  
selection  
of trans-  
lators.

CHAP.

X.

Matthew  
Parker.

1559. 75.

selected by himself: they were to collate the various translations already made, to correct them, and where need might be, to supersede them by a new translation. He endeavoured to engage Cecil in the work, and though he did not succeed, the fact of this proposal proves two things,—that Cecil retained, amidst the turmoils of office, the scholarship for which he had been distinguished at Cambridge; and that Parker did not reject, but rather sought, without being able to obtain, the assistance of laymen. The archbishop was to act as editor of the whole volume, each translator submitting his labours to the supervision and correction of the primate. Parker acted on a principle which he adopted on other occasions: although he caused the initials or other private mark to be affixed to the work of each of the translators, he did not permit it to be generally known who the translators were; his desire being, that the translation should be regarded as the work of the Church, not as that of a few learned men, acting independently and without rule. The editorial duties being assumed by the primate, and synodal sanction being obtained for the volume when completed, he was justified in thus crediting the work to the Church; and what the Church in one age sanctioned, the Church in another age might correct. The one great object of Parker was to avoid Sectarianism, which stereotypes its doctrines and renders improvement impossible. The archbishop laid down certain regulations or rules to be observed by the translators. They were to follow the Great Bible, and to make alterations only when there was a manifest deviation from the Greek or Hebrew original. With an evident allusion to the Geneva Bible, the English translators were warned “to make no use of bitter notes upon any text, or yet to set down any determination in places of controversy.” Chapters and places “con-



taining matter of genealogies, or other such places not edifying," were to be noted with some mark that the reader might eschew them in his public reading. Words which in the old translation "sounded to any offence of lightness or obscenity, were to be expressed in more convenient terms and phrases." The archbishop found an able coadjutor in the Bishop of Ely, Dr. Cox, who urged the avoidance as much as possible of "ink-horn terms," and an adherence "to such usual words as in English people are acquainted with, so far forth as the Hebrew could bear it."

CHAP.

X.

Matthew  
Parker.

1559-75.

Besides his duties as general editor, the archbishop himself undertook the translation of the Books of Genesis and Exodus in the Old Testament, and in the New, of St. Matthew and St. Mark, with the Epistles of St. Paul, excepting the Epistle to the Romans and the First to the Corinthians. "The Sun of the Scriptures and the Tables of Christ's Line," the Preface to the Psalter, the Preface to the whole Bible, and the Preface to the New Testament were also attributed to Parker.

The Bishops' Bible was published in 1568, in a magnificent volume, printed by J. Jugge, *cum privilegio regie majestatis*. Canon Westcott remarks on the favourable contrast it affords when compared with other versions, including the Genevan version, to the effect that no words of flattery, such as disfigure and disgrace the Calvinistic version, can be found in the Bishops' version. It is even without a dedication.

Notwithstanding the manœuvres of the Calvinists, and the influence of their patron, the profligate Leicester,\* when

\* Leicester evidently used his influence with the queen to delay her acceptance of the volume. It was signified at last through the Canons of the Church, which could have had no legal effect unless they had been authorized by the crown.



CHAP.  
X.Matthew  
Parker.

1559-75.

the Bishops' Bible had fair play, it was so well received that it superseded, to a considerable extent, the Geneva Bible. To this great work justice was not done during the primacy of Grindal; but, even in spite of difficulties, it became the basis of that authorized version which is now upheld by the very Calvinists by whom it was at first opposed. It was enjoined that each cathedral should have a copy, and the same provision was extended, "so far as it could conveniently be done," to all parochial churches; but not only this, it was ordered, moreover, "that every archbishop and bishop should have at his house a copy, to be placed in the hall or large dining-room, that it might be useful to their servants or to strangers."

The assertions of Calvinists in favour of the Geneva Bible have been, and still are, very often taken for granted, even by those to whom Calvin is not a hero deserving worship. It is said, and most probably with truth, that the Greek scholarship was superior to the Hebrew; but, as regards the New Testament, the translators were evidently up to the scholarship of the age; and, indeed, if they were indebted to the Genevan translators, they certainly were not more so than they were to every other translator. So far from deferring on all points to the Swiss interpreters or translators, our divines called in the assistance of Chatillon, or, as he called himself, Castalio, who had been attacked by Beza with all the intolerant vehemence which is characteristic of his age and party.

The tendency of the age, from which the Church of Rome did not itself escape,\* was to sectarianize Churches; or to create sects by providing each with a compact system of doctrine reasoned out into minute detail. By its

\* This may be seen in some of the definitions of the Council of Trent, and especially in the catechism of Pope Pius.

“Confession,” as such a document was technically called, each sect was to be distinguished from every other community of Christians.\* The human mind is, from its very constitution, logical, and men are led into error not so much by conclusions wrongly drawn, but by premises accepted without examination. Hence a love of system sectarianizes the mind; and we are not surprised to hear that a demand was soon raised in England for the adoption of one or other of the continental Confessions, or else for the creation of a national Confession, to form the peculiarity of the English Church, thus narrowed to a sect. With these demands, some of the earlier reformers, such as Cranmer, sympathized; but by the marvellous and special Providence of God, which has ever watched over the English Church, they found difficulties in the way which they were unable to surmount. The whole tendency of Parker’s mind and of his system of theology ran in the opposite direction; and to his prudence we are indebted for an escape from what would have constituted us a sect, and have prevented for ever our union with other branches of the Catholic Church.

CHAP.  
X.  
Matthew  
Parker.  
1559-75.  
Confes-  
sions of  
faith.

But Parker had soon to encounter a practical difficulty; a difficulty which seems to have been overlooked by the learned divines who have treated on the Thirty-nine Articles, but which must materially influence our judgment of that formulary. The difficulty arose from

State of  
the  
country.

\* If a Lutheran rejects the Lutheran Confession of Faith, or the Calvinist the Calvinistic system, the first ceases to be a Lutheran and the second a Calvinist. The difference between these Confessions and the Thirty-nine Articles is apparent at once to those who pay attention to the subject. If Convocation were to reject the Thirty-nine Articles to-morrow, the Church of England would remain, as it has always been, a living body, having in that character as much right to reject the Thirty-nine Articles in the nineteenth century as it had to enforce them in the sixteenth.

## CHAP.

## X.

Matthew  
Parker.

1559-75.

the condition of the country, and of that condition we have Parker's own statement. In a long letter addressed to Sir Nicholas Bacon, in March, 1558-9, from which quotations have been already made, the archbishop, after having denounced, in unqualified terms, John Knox \* and his mischievous political pamphlets, proceeds thus: "They say the realm is full of Anabaptists, Arians, Libertines, Free-will Men, &c., *against whom only I thought ministers should be needed to fight in unity of doctrine.* As to the Romish adversaries, *their* mouths may be stopped with their books and confessions of late days." The archbishop received a letter from the queen to the same purpose. The queen's majesty complains of an influx of foreigners into England, "some of whom," she said, "were infected with dangerous opinions, contrary to the faith of Christ's Church."

While the Protestants and the whole reforming party were thus divided; the controversy became the more acrimonious by the extreme and uncharitable violence with which all these parties, however differing from one another, united in their vituperation of whatsoever they designated as popery.

No wonder that complaint was, under these circumstances, made of a diversity of teaching on the part of the

\* Parker alludes particularly to "The first Blast of the Trumpet against the monstrous Regimen of Women. By John Knox." This is described by Hardwick as "a savage treatise." Of John Knox, Archbishop Parker and the English reformers had a just abhorrence. In writing to Cecil in November, 1559, Parker prays that God may preserve the Church from such a visitation as Knox.—*Correspondence*, p. 105. Randolph, in a letter to Cecil, quoted by Nares, says of the Calvinistic preachers in Scotland, "they are as wilful as they are unlearned." Of John Knox he said, "He is more vehement than decent or learned. On Sunday last he gave the cross and the candle such a wipe, that those as learned and wise as himself wished him to have held his peace."

preachers; nor are we surprised that in consequence of this complaint, it was considered necessary, not indeed to devise a scheme of theology, but to take measures to create an agreement upon certain of the more prominent points of controversy, among those whose business it was to instruct a people whose ignorance was, taking the mass of them, profound. On this ground the articles had been drawn up at the episcopal "assessus;" and Parker could not resist a demand for an increase in the number of articles, and for the submission of them, when they rose to the importance of a formulary, to the judgment of Convocation.

This was the origin of the far-famed Thirty-nine Articles. Parker clearly understood the nature of the task which devolved upon him. He was not to draw up a new scheme of doctrine. It had been already ruled that, in the Church of England, the preachers were to accept the tradition of the Church and to carry it on, except when synods, on comparing the tradition with holy Scripture—the fallible tradition with the infallible Word of God—had found the tradition to be at fault. Amid the entangled web of human controversy Parker had to point out what, in their teaching, the preachers were to avoid; or if there was recourse, in any instance, to dogma, it was simply because it was only by a statement of fact, that the nature of a controversy could be debated. Certain things the English clergy were not to teach, because, upon those particular points the Church of England had spoken authoritatively; beyond this there was liberty. They were not to inquire what Luther or Calvin opined, but what the Church in all ages had taught, and what the English Church in her late synods, held under the authority of the sovereign, had decreed.

CHAP.  
X.

Matthew  
Parker.  
1559-75.

Thirty-  
nine  
Articles.

That the Thirty-nine Articles were intended to be



CHAP.  
X.

Matthew  
Parker.  
1559-75.

articles of peace is an assertion which cannot be substantiated by history. There was no immediate attempt to force men to concur in opinion; this Parker knew to be an impossibility; the desire was, to prevent them from disputing in public, by showing that on certain controverted points, the Church, in synod, had given judgment; and men were called to act modestly by "hearing the Church." That the Thirty-nine Articles, as drawn up by Parker, were controversial articles we may admit—we may even contend; but, as we have shown, the controversy was not directed against the Catholic party, as is sometimes supposed. The Catholics were in possession of most of the churches; the Romanists, using the word in its strict sense, had already left the Church—that is, those who insisted upon the papal supremacy had quitted their preferments and had gone abroad; a large party, the vast majority of the clergy, remained in the English Church, reprobating popery, but retaining a love for mediæval practices if not always for mediæval doctrine; and among those there were some who were willing to abjure allegiance to the pope, but who could not make up their minds to take the oath of royal supremacy, as tendered by the government. This large body of both clergy and laity, Cecil, as a statesman, had no wish to offend; the queen had an abhorrence of Calvin and the Calvinistic tenets; and the archbishop himself was accused, and he admitted to a certain extent the justice of the charge, that he treated this body of men with leniency; he declined, when they conducted themselves peaceably, to press upon them the oath of supremacy. Add to this what has been before affirmed, that all political parties were at this time afraid, not of the Catholics, but of the ultra-Protestants, and it will be admitted, that when modern controversialists would assume an exclusive

Protestant character for the Thirty-nine Articles, they speak from conjecture, not from history. So far from denying that they are opposed to much which is now called Romanism, the historian must affirm it; but his affirmation must be equally strong, that they are in the same degree opposed to much which in these days would be regarded as Protestantism.

The Articles will never be clearly understood unless their strictly controversial character, as well as their position in combating the two extremes, be fully admitted. They are sometimes censured as containing an imperfect statement of doctrine: this criticism, however, vanishes when, on an appeal to history, it is found, that no general statement of doctrine was intended; and that a statement on certain controverted points of theology or religious practice then in vogue was all that was intended, as, indeed, it is all that we find. To the careless reader it may appear that this statement is contradicted by the first five Articles; but upon examination it will be found, that they had a controversial aspect, and stand opposed, not to Romanism, much less to Catholicism, but to ultra-Protestantism. The Nicene doctrine, so clearly stated in the Articles, was accepted by Catholics of every shade of opinion, whether *Anglo-Catholics* or *Roman Catholics*; they were, when not opposed, only partially accepted by ultra-Protestants, of whom the queen and statesmen who now imposed the Articles had a just abhorrence—the Anabaptists, the Arians, the Libertines, and “Unitarians” of every form; and to these perhaps the learned reader will add the Calvinists, for although Calvin accepted the doctrine of the Trinity, he did not receive the Nicene definition of that divine truth—the definition adopted in the Articles.

CHAP.

X.

Matthew  
Parker.

1559-75.

CHAP.

X.

Matthew  
Parker.

1559-75.

As against the Romanists\* the 22nd Article is regarded as specially pointed; but without any desire to defend their cause, we must not forget, that the medievalists who still composed the Church, did not think that it of necessity concerned them. Purgatory, pardons, images, relics, and the invocation of saints were held by the *Romanists* of the day; but the conforming *Catholics* maintained that on most of these subjects there was a doctrine which was distinguishable from modern notions prevalent in the Church of Rome, and which without censure could be held and enforced. They argued, that there was in the primitive Church a view of these doctrines distinct from what was, at this period, held by the Romanists and opposed by Protestants. Now the Church of England, it was argued, cannot condemn the primitive Church, because to the Catholic fathers and to the ancient bishops, as in the case of Jewel's challenge, she makes her appeal against Rome. They therefore continued their conformity as the government desired; and Archbishop Parker would not disturb them if they conducted themselves like peaceable subjects, loyal to Church and queen. The simple historical statement, that this article did not drive them into nonconformity, the extreme Romanists having left them, establishes the fact, that as conforming medievalists argue now, so they argued in the sixteenth century. There were conforming Catholics and there were conforming Puritans, and these the government, with equal-handed justice, desired to

\* The words *ROMANENSES* and *ROMANISTÆ* were used by Luther and Ulrich Von Hutten to designate the extreme party,—what we should now call the Ultra-Montanes. So far back, says Archdeacon Hardwick, p. 389, as the year 1520, Bishop Forbes remarks, in addition, “Just so, in modern French, the expression *parti romaniste* is used for the more prominent section of the Ultra-Montanes.”

protect from persecuting papists on the one hand, and from Puritans equally bitter in their persecution on the other hand.

CHAP.  
X.

Matthew  
Parker.

1559-75.

At the same time, while we admit that the Article just mentioned, together with some others, was directed against the extreme on the Catholic side, there are other Articles, in which the medievalists were one with the English reformers, and by which the ultra-Protestants were even more pointedly condemned. Such are the Articles on the three Creeds, on the Church, on the Authority of the Church, on the Consecration of Bishops; to these we may add the 38th Article, on that Socialism which was confounded in many minds with Protestantism, and the 39th Article, on a Christian Man's Oath. No one can accuse contemporary Catholics of error on these points; and these Articles are, in consequence, directed against the Protestants, by some of whom the most lax opinions were at that time held. The Articles on the Sacraments are, to the Catholic mind, the least satisfactory. It is, however, to be remembered, that they were drawn up before the definitions of the Council of Trent were accepted by Romanists; while on no one subject was the Protestant world more divided. To these Articles the extremes on either side would be unwilling to give a full consent; but certainly, if the extreme on one side should contend that by them Romanism is condemned, the extreme on the other side could adduce proof of a designed condemnation of ultra-Protestantism. One remarkable fact is often lost sight of, namely—that in confining the term Sacrament—except in the lax sense in which the term is applied in the Homilies—to two only of the ordinances of the Gospel, the object was not to depreciate the other means of grace, but to elevate these two. If we were in these



CHAP.

X.

— M atthew  
Parker.

1559-75.

days to speak of seven Sacraments, we can easily imagine the fierceness with which we should be assailed, but it would be very difficult to say why. Ultra-Protestants do not discard Baptism and the Supper of the Lord, but they do not admit them to be means of grace, more than other ordinances—for example, preaching. Our reformers, on the contrary, held that by baptism we are united to Christ, and that by the Holy Eucharist our union with Him is continued. Other ordinances are means of grace—but not of that special grace which makes these two generally necessary to salvation. The English reformers, and those who co-operated with Parker in drawing up the Thirty-nine Articles, did not, like Zwingli and Calvin, and other ultra-Protestants, regard these two Sacraments only as “badges or tokens of Christian men’s profession.” Using the word “sign” in the technical sense in which it was understood by the universal Church, for the outward part of any Sacrament, they directed the 27th Article against the ultra-Protestants exclusively; Baptism being a sign of regeneration, or new birth, whereby, as by an instrument, they that receive Baptism rightly are grafted into the Body of Christ. In like manner, the 28th Article begins with an attack on the low view adopted by ultra-Protestants, and proceeds to affirm that, although Transubstantiation—a particular explanation of the real presence of Him who has declared Himself present whenever two or three are assembled in his name—be rejected because it is repugnant to the plain words of Scripture, yet if we rightly, worthily, and with faith receive the outward and visible signs, the bread and wine, we partake of the body and blood of Christ.

It is not intended here, however, to explain the Articles, but simply to place before the reader the view taken by

Parker, and those who assisted him in drawing them. The archbishop realized his position. He was not the founder of a sect deciding upon a scheme of theology, by the acceptance of which his sect would be at all times distinguished; he was a Catholic metropolitan, keeping watch and ward over the deposit he had received. He took the Forty-two Articles for the bases of his proceedings, and then was prepared to submit to Convocation a formulary, the impartiality of which is proved by the fact, that it has been claimed by both extremes, though belonging exclusively to the *via media*—that mean in which truth is sure to be found. The Calvinists, at the commencement of this century, claimed the Articles as abetting them; and now, at the close of the century, the tables are turned, and a Scottish prelate has published a learned treatise on the Articles, intended to show that they are exclusively Catholic.

The archbishop, in preparing the Articles, invited the co-operation of the Bishop of Ely, Dr. Cox, on whose principles and good sense he could entirely rely; of Dr. Gheast, the Bishop of Rochester, a weak man, but easily influenced by the archbishop; and of the Bishop of London, Dr. Grindal, a man whom he loved for his many virtues, and who, notwithstanding his Puritan proclivities, was not a party man, although his ambition was a weakness, as it consisted in a desire to please all parties.

The bases of the proceedings being the Latin Articles of 1553, we refer with interest to a document preserved in the far-famed library of Corpus Christi College, Cambridge, an exact copy of which has been printed by Dr. Lamb. In this document we find several alterations made in Parker's handwriting, so far as the original is concerned, while in the printed copy they are given to us in italics.

CHAP.  
X.

Matthew  
Parker.  
1559-75.

CHAP.  
X.

Matthew  
Parker.  
1559-75.

The archbishop added four new Articles, and as many in number were omitted. In seventeen others, alterations were made to a greater or less extent. The Articles erased were the 10th, Of Grace, and the 16th, Of Blasphemy of the Holy Ghost; together with the 19th, Of the Obligation of all to observe the Principles of the Moral Law, and the 41st, against the Millenarians. The four Articles added were the 5th, Of the Holy Spirit; the 12th, Of Good Works; the 29th, Of the Wicked which eat not the Body of Christ in the use of the Lord's Supper; and the 30th, Of both kinds.

In the 2nd Article the clause is introduced, "begotten from everlasting of the Father, the very and eternal God." This was an addition which the Catholics required, because among the Protestants, as we have remarked before, although the sects did not, in general, deny the doctrine of the Trinity, there were some who demurred to the definition, "Deus de Deo." Regard here was had to the error, not of Romanists, but of ultra-Protestants. We may further remark on the omission in the 3rd Article, of our Lord's preaching to the spirits in prison. This was omitted because, between the publishing of the Forty-two Articles and the drawing up of the Thirty-nine, almost all controversy on the subject had ceased. Surely this not only proves the temporary nature of the Articles in the design of the archbishop who drew them up and of the Convocation which first adopted them, but it ought also to be adduced as an example worthy of imitation. If the Articles were altered in the sixteenth century on points upon which no controversy existed,—to require men to sign Articles in the nineteenth century, concerning which no controversy at present exists, is an inconsistency from which we may expect to be relieved. At a period when many are oblivious of the distinction which exists be-

tween the Catholic Church, on the one hand, and the Protestant sects and Romanism on the other; at a period when we find ignorance prevailing on some of the fundamental verities of the Christian faith, we ought either to have no Articles, or to have them entirely revised.\*

The two Articles respecting the Old and New Testament were remodelled, and a list of the canonical and apocryphal books was appended. In the 10th, Of Freewill, the 9th and 10th of the preceding series of Articles were united. The 11th, Of the Justification of Man, and the 12th, Of Good Works, were enlarged; to the title of the 16th were added the words, "after Baptism." From the 17th was withdrawn a clause which affirmed that the divine decrees are unknown to us. In the 22nd, Of Purgatory, the archbishop, with his usual caution, substituted the word Romish for that of Schoolmen. The 24th, Of Speaking in the Congregation in such a tongue as the people understandeth, was drawn up in stronger terms than before. The 25th, Of the Sacraments, was so framed as to make the distinction clear between the Sacraments and the Sacramentals, the ordinances which unite to Christ, and the other means of grace. He elevated the former without unduly depressing the latter. In the 28th, alterations were made which have been already noticed.†

\* The treatises on the Thirty-nine Articles are numerous. The historical student will study Lamb, Hardwick, Cardwell's Synodalia, the Bishop of Ely, and the Bishop of Brechin. The learned reader will refer to Strype; but the student must be warned, that in what relates to the Thirty-nine Articles, and Parker's concern with them, Dr. Lamb shows him to have been inaccurate.

† It appears from the correspondence of our clergy with the foreign reformers, that on the subject of the Eucharist there was known to exist great differences of opinion among the divines of the Church of England. See Zurich's Letters, ii. 125, 143. Dorman, in his "Dis-



CHAP.

X.

Matthew  
Parker.

559-75.

In the 32nd, a clause was added by which Parker availed himself of this opportunity to carry a point, upon the carrying of which his heart had long been fixed ; and the legality of marriage on the part of bishops, priests, and deacons was at length openly affirmed—made even an article of faith. In the 34th, it was declared that every particular and national Church hath authority to ordain, cherish, or abolish ceremonies and rites of the Church ; and the man is censured, whosoever by his private judgment should openly break the traditions and ceremonies of the Church. The titles of the Homilies were given in the 35th, and this Article, as well as the 36th, Of Consecration of Bishops, was entirely recomposed. In the 37th, Of the Civil Magistrates, in opposition to

proufe of Al. Nouelles Reproofe," written in 1565, asserts that there were great differences of opinion expressed in the synod of 1562. He affirms that, while some, like Edmund Gheast, Bishop of Rochester, preached "The Real Presence," others, like Grindal, denied it. Parker, he says, was suspected of being a Lutheran. Parker was not narrow-minded, and he referred to things new as well as old in forming his judgments—to the ancient fathers and to modern divines ; but among moderns he would have as little to do with the Swiss or Calvinistic party as possible. Like the English reformers who preceded him, he consulted Lutheran, not Helvetian confessions ; Lutherans deferring to, and Calvinists thinking scorn of, the traditions of the primitive Church. The article on the Lord's Supper, as revised by Parker and his associates, was especially distasteful to the "Swiss Party." Humphrys and Sampson, writing to Bullinger in 1566, complain that the article which oppugned and took away the Real Presence in the Eucharist in King Edward's Articles, was now so mutilated as to express that doctrine. It was at the suggestion of Bishop Gheast, one of Parker's coadjutors, that the paragraph was added, that the Body of Christ is given, taken, and eaten in the Lord's Supper. He fully admitted the fact in a letter to Cecil, lately discovered among the State Papers, and quoted in pages 379-80 of this volume. Parker, who was charged with being at the head of a Lutherano-papistical ministry, admits that there was material difference of opinion among the members of the synod.

Knox and other ultra-Protestants, the royal authority is asserted, and, so far as it pertains to things ecclesiastical, explained.

The archbishop had prepared himself to submit several other proposals for legislation to the synod. He proposed, for instance, to make regulations with reference to the apparel of the clergy, and to take more stringent measures to prevent "the clashing of doctrine" which appeared in the sermons of some of the preachers. The money payments made for a release from ecclesiastical censures he desired to see appropriated to "pious uses," and at the same time, that care should be taken for the infliction of the punishment due to persons excommunicated. He intended to introduce a measure—carried only within the last few years—for placing peculiars and the sites of monasteries under episcopal superintendence; and that simony should be punished in the case of the presenter as well as in that of the presentee. Several questions of minor importance suggested themselves to his mind, such as related to dilapidations, to tenths, and subsidies; to the pensions to be paid to the religious, that is, to monks or nuns who had been driven, or who had voluntarily retired, from the monasteries; and for the relief of the poorer clergy. Owing to the difficulty of managing the Convocation, and the opposition of the courtiers hostile to the Church, Parker was unable to carry these wise measures; but that we are justified in speaking of them as wise, is apparent from the fact, that several of these very measures have been enacted in our days; and by this delay in their enactment, abuses have been permitted to remain in the Church, to the detriment of the institution, and to the danger of public morality.

CHAP.  
X.

Matthew  
Parker.

1559-75.

Apparel of  
the clergy.

Ecclesiastical  
censures.

Excommu-  
nication.

Peculiars.

Simony.

Dilapida-  
tions.  
Pensions  
to the  
religious.

## CHAPTER XI.

## PARKER IN CONVOCATION.

Programme for the opening of Convocation drawn up by the Archbishop.  
 —Meeting of Convocation on 12th of January.—Sermon preached by the Provost of Eton.—Dean Nowell prolocutor.—Defaulters pronounced contumacious.—Meetings at the Chapter House of St. Paul's and in Henry VII.'s Chapel.—Revolutionary measures of the minority.  
 —Bishop Sandys.—Alterations proposed in the Prayer Book.—Minority of thirty-three.—Dissenting tactics.—Church saved by Anglo-Catholics.—Prolocutor accepted by the Primate.—Thirty-nine Articles accepted by the Northern Convocation as well as by that of Canterbury.—Clause in the 20th Article.—Nowell's Catechisms.—Cecil and Parker opposed to Sectarianism.—Catechism formally received but not adopted by the Synod.—Freedom of speech encouraged.—Legislation prevented.—Unsatisfactory state of the Temporalities.—Dissolution of Convocation.—Parker's description of the members.  
 —Lenient policy.—Clerical apparel.—Marriage with a deceased wife's sister.—Convocation of 1571.—Subscription to the Articles.—Catholicism of the English Church.—Ancient Catholic canons still the law of the Church of England.—Convocation of 1572.—Archbishop's speech.

CHAP.  
XI.

Matthew  
Parker.  
1559-75.

PUBLIC processions and ceremonials of state were peculiarly irksome to a man like Parker, whose tastes were simple and whose health was infirm. Nevertheless he was aware, that he is no philosopher who does not attend to little things; and at a time when the courtiers were endeavouring to bring the Church into contempt, he was determined not to abate any part of the magnificence which had hitherto marked the opening of Convocation

—an event regarded with an interest only second to that which was excited by the opening of parliament.\*

The programme of the proceedings under which Convocation was to be opened was, if not drawn up by the archbishop, submitted to his inspection, and was by him carefully revised. Both the queen and the archbishop were careful to remind the people, that they had no intention to establish a Protestant sect in England; and that, although the old Catholic Church was to be reformed, it was, nevertheless, to remain the same old Church, even as a man, when his face has been washed, remains the same man he was before; and therefore Parker adhered strictly to ancient precedent. The Reformation, however, required that some slight alterations should be made in the programme. This was so skilfully drawn out, that the Convocation is, to the present hour, opened as nearly as possible according to the precedent established by Parker, who did himself only modify, and that very slightly, the forms which had been observed in the medieval Church. Of our public ceremonies, the opening of Convocation is the most striking, with the exception only of the opening of parliament by the sovereign in person.

The Convocation was summoned to meet on the 12th of January. It was on that day opened by Dr. Robert Weston, the archbishop's official of the Court of Canter-

CHAP.  
XI.

Matthew.  
Parker.  
1559-75.

Opening  
of Convo-  
cation.  
January  
12, 1562.

\* The registers of this Convocation were destroyed in the fire of London, 1666. But a journal of the proceedings of the Upper House, taken from certain extracts of the proceedings of Convocation from 1529 to 1562, was published by Bishop Gibson in his *Synodus Anglicana* in 1702. See also Strype's *Annals*, I. ii. 471; and Hardwick on the *Thirty-nine Articles*, p. 133. Joyce, on *English Synods*, p. 554, traces the outlines of the proceedings from the *Acta in Superiore Domo Convocationis, Anno 1562*, printed by Strype,



CHAP.  
XI.

Matthew  
Parker.

1559-75.

bury, in virtue of a commission from the primate. The commission issued by his grace to Dr. Weston, to Thomas Yale, the archbishop's vice-general in spirituals; to Henry Jones, and to Valentine Dale, advocate of his Court of Arches. The commission empowered them, or some of them, to continue and prorogue the synod until the next day, Wednesday, the 13th of January.

Procession  
of the  
arch-  
bishop.

At eight o'clock in the morning of the 13th of January, 1562-3, the Lord Archbishop entered his state barge,\* accompanied by the Lord Bishop of Lincoln; and passing down the most splendid thoroughfare of London, he landed at Paul's Wharf. Here his grace was met by the advocates, proctors, and other officials of his court; and they preceded him and the Bishop of Lincoln on foot to the south door of St. Paul's Cathedral. At the south door, the dean, the canons, and other ministers of the cathedral, arrayed in their surplices, were in waiting, to escort his grace to the vestry. In the vestry, the archbishop found his suffragans in attendance; and having assumed the archiepiscopal vestments, he took his place in a procession formed by his suffragans, all of whom were arrayed in their convocation robes. They were preceded by the cathedral clergy in their surplices.† The bishop of the diocese, of course, occupied the throne: the dean's stall was appropriated to the archbishop; his

\* I take the account chiefly from the *Acta in Superiore Domo Convocationis inceptæ Anno 1562*, as printed in the *Synodus Anglicana*. The archbishop's progress is described, and he is represented as "*solvens in naviculâ suâ vulgo nuncupata a Barge ad ripam vocatam Paul's Wharf.*"

† The frequent reference to the robes of the bishops and the other clergy was occasioned by the "vestment controversy," then beginning. The account drawn up, probably under Parker's inspection, might be useful in showing, that conformity in this respect was expected on the part of all who accepted the episcopal office.

suffragans being placed, on either side, in the stalls of the prebendaries. The ministers of the church, the priest vicars and lay vicars together, chanted the Litany in English. The Latin tongue, as has been subsequently the custom, might have been used; but to avoid offence, both the Litany and the *Veni Creator* which followed, were sung in English. The Provost of Eton was appointed preacher on the occasion. His degree was that of B.D., and he preached in a black gown, that is, in the gown and hood of a Bachelor of Divinity. The pulpit was moved into the body of the church; and there the provost delivered a Latin discourse, taking for his text, 1 Peter v. 2—"Pascite quantum in vobis est," etc. The sermon ended, the first Psalm was chanted, and the Holy Communion was celebrated, the celebrant being "the Reverend Father, Lord Edmund Grindal, bishop of the diocese." The archbishop and his suffragans received "the Sacrament of the Saviour's Body and Blood."

CHAP.  
XI.

Matthew  
Parker.

1559-75.

Sermon in  
St. Paul's.

Returning to the Chapter House, the bishops formed a semicircle around the archbishop. His grace was seated in the middle, the suffragans being arranged on either side. Some formal business having been first transacted, the archbishop addressed the bishops and clergy there and then assembled. He reminded them, that although a reformation of the Church had been commenced, yet it was not completed. Much remained to be done. The main business of the synod would therefore be to set in order the things that were wanting in the Church. He assured them that it was the earnest desire of the queen and her councillors to render every assistance in their power, that the good work already begun might be brought to a happy termination. He directed the prelates and clergy of the Lower House\* to make choice of a referendary or

Assembly  
in the  
Chapter  
House.

Arch-  
bishop's  
address.

\* They are styled "*Prælatos et clerum inferioris domus.*" The title

CHAP.  
XI.Matthew  
Parker.  
1559-75.Alexander  
Nowell  
elected  
prolo-  
cutor.

prolocutor; and, as the manner then was, having granted a liberty, he immediately infringed upon the grant by significantly recommending to their choice the dean of the cathedral in which they were at that time assembled, Alexander Nowell. They were to present him for the approval of the President of the Convocation, on the following Saturday. The archbishop commissioned his chancellor to receive the bishops' certificatories, and having pronounced those who had not obeyed the present summons contumacious, he adjourned the Convocation. At two o'clock on the day appointed, the 16th of January, the Convocation again met in the Chapter House of St. Paul's. The Latin Litany was sung by the archbishop himself in a clear and distinct voice; the bishops and clergy present joining in the responses.

Presenta-  
tion of  
prolocu-  
tor.

The two Houses having separated after prayers, the Lower House after a short interval re-appeared. Dr. Alexander Nowell, Dean of St. Paul's, was introduced by Gabriel Goodman, Dean of Westminster, and Thomas Simpson, Dean of Exeter, as the person elected by the Lower House to be their prolocutor or referendary. Dean Nowell, as the custom then was, in the appointment both of a speaker of the House of Commons and a prolocutor of the Lower House of Convocation, depreciated himself, and gave sundry reasons to prove his insufficiency for the office, though, if it were forced upon him, he intimated his willingness to accept it. Another form was observed—the Upper House required the Lower House to retire while their lordships deliberated on the appointment. Everything having been pre-arranged, this form did not consume much time; and on the re-admission of

of Prelates is not confined in our public documents to bishops. Under that denomination are included deans and archdeacons, and any of the clergy who possess ordinary jurisdiction over their brethren.



the Lower House, the election of Dean Nowell was confirmed, subject to the sanction of the queen.

The attendance of the bishops in the House of Lords then sitting would be occasionally required, and therefore, to meet their convenience, the next session of Convocation was appointed to be held in Westminster Abbey.\* On the 19th, the Dean of Westminster appeared to protest against the assumption of any rights on the part of Convocation within the precincts of the Abbey. It was admitted by the archbishop, that this Convocation was held in the precincts of the Abbey only by the courtesy of the dean and chapter. This form is continued to the present day.

We must attribute to the quiet and unobtrusive policy of the archbishop a fact otherwise unaccountable, that most historians have overlooked, the violent and revolutionary measures proposed by a considerable party in the Convocation of 1563, which, if carried out, would have annihilated the Church. The conforming Puritans, those who, adhering to Calvinistic theology, had a desire to share likewise in the tithes and broad acres still in the possession of the Church of England, formed a compact body in the Convocation, to the number of rather more than thirty. From their principles and their temper we may form some notion of the difficulties with which Archbishop Parker had to contend; and in the frustration of their machinations, so calmly effected, we read the wisdom and self-command of the metropolitan.

As usual under such circumstances, this party was abetted by those who had little or no sympathy with them in their opinions; but who sought popularity, and were ambitious of appearing to the queen and to the states-

CHAP.  
XI.

Matthew  
Parker.

1559-75.

Revolutionary  
measures  
proposed.

\* "In capella nuncupata Henry VII.'s Chapel infra Ecclesiam collegiatam Divi Petri Westminster situata."—Acta in Convoc. Anno 1562,



CHAP.  
XI.Matthew  
Parker.

1559-75.

Edwin  
Sandys.

men of the age as better qualified to direct ecclesiastical affairs than the infirm primate. Among these was Sandys, Bishop of Worcester, a worldly man, who gave the archbishop considerable trouble, although he always professed to be personally attached to him, and probably did value his friendship. Like the latitudinarian prelates of our own time, he was found to be in his diocese so despotic and tyrannical, that Parker, firm to his principles, but lenient in his dealings with offenders, felt it his duty to remonstrate with him. As age advanced, and ambition cooled, Sandys took a more correct view of his duties; and on the archbishop's death he appeared as one of the mourners, deploring, with evident sincerity, the loss of one who had the faculty of attaching his friends, and of winning to his friendship many who had at one time been among his opponents.

In the Convocation of 1563, and for some time after, Sandys was not only opposed to the archbishop, but in his correspondence scarcely expressed himself with the decorum and respect due from a diocesan to his ecclesiastical superior.

A mischievous project was brought before the Upper House by Sandys, who was aware, on the one hand, that in the House of which he was himself a member, it would receive scarcely any support, while it would secure his popularity with the Puritan party in the Lower House. These, though powerful in influence and learning, and not contemptible in numbers, were, nevertheless, not likely to carry it, for the majority of the House consisted of the Anglo-Catholics, who were prepared to vote rather than to talk.\* Bishop Sandys proposed certain

\* We cannot suppose, when those at the head of affairs were accustomed to pack the House of Commons, that Parker had not taken measures to secure a majority in Convocation favourable to Church

alterations to be made in the Book of Common Prayer, and he arranged his proposals under the three following heads :—

I. In cases of necessity, women, duly licensed, had, from time immemorial, been permitted to baptize children when in danger of their lives. Among the inconsistencies of party, the Puritans, who profess to have no faith in the grace of orders, and who regard the clergy only as preachers, took umbrage at this custom; and the Bishop of Worcester proposed, that the rubric granting the licence should be altered, by the authority of the archbishop as regarded the Church, and of the queen as regarded the State. The Bishop of London, Dr. Grindal, opposed the Erastianism of Sandys, and contended that the authority to alter rested with the synod. The real difficulty with Sandys was this: the Prayer-Book having been embodied in an Act of the legislature, an alteration could hardly take place without submitting it to parliament. The metropolitan, however, could make the change so far as the requirements of the Church were concerned, and Sandys thought that the queen's *imprimatur* would serve the purpose of an Act of Parliament.

II. Under this head Sandys proposed the abolition of the cross in baptism, but was defeated.

III. He then proposed a Royal Commission to draw up a scheme of Church discipline and government, and sought to remove the former objections to his proposals by suggesting, that application should be made to

views. It was his policy to permit the Puritans to be fully represented, though kept in a minority; for although he much feared the ultra-Protestants, he must have felt that the medieval party required to be kept in check, and he was not unwilling to let them see the extreme measures which would be forced upon them, if they did not give their support to his moderate reforms.

CHAP.  
XI.

Matthew  
Parker.

1559-75.

CHAP.  
XI.Matthew  
Parker.  
1559-75.

Parliament to make their recommendation a law of the realm.\*

These proposals were evidently made to sound the Convocation, and to ascertain whether Church principles were still recognized by the episcopal bench and the majority of the other clergy. It is satisfactory to know that the Bishop of Worcester was supported by not one of his right reverend brethren.

Minority  
of thirty-  
three.

In the Lower House the party was more determined, and a schedule was introduced, signed by thirty-three members. It contained seven articles, directly pointed against the Catholic customs and primitive principles of the Church. They first denounced all scientific music, together with the use of the organ in divine service; requiring the psalms to be sung by the whole congregation, or to be said by the minister alone. As in the case of the bishop, with a strange inconsistency, the party which did not believe that any special grace is imparted to a minister when he is ordained, declaimed against lay baptism, and, with less inconsistency, against the use of the cross in the administration of that Sacrament. As regards the Eucharist, they would leave it to the ordinary to decide whether the communicant should receive kneeling; and they were particularly opposed to such actions, almost universally prevalent, as smiting upon the breast. Our blessed Lord seems to have commended the poor publican for doing so, but the action may have been, even at that time, offensive to the Pharisees. Copes and surplices were to be discarded; and the clergy were discharged from wearing, in common use, such gowns and caps as had been worn from time immemorial,

\* For an account of the Committee, see Strype's Annals, I. i. 470; Conc. Mag. Brit. iv. 239; Collier, vi. 371; Synodus Anglicana; and Joye's English Synods, p. 363, *et seq.*

on the ground that they were still worn by the Roman priesthood.

Festivals and saints' days were to be discontinued. The 34th Article gave to these dissenters extreme annoyance; for, although it declared, what no Catholic could deny, that it is not necessary that traditions and ceremonies should be in all places one and utterly alike, it adds that, "who-soever, through his private judgment, willingly and purposely doth openly break the traditions and ceremonies of the Church . . . ought to be openly rebuked."

Enough has been here advanced to show how perilous the times were; and this will strike us the more strongly when we remark, that the schedule containing these proposals, reduced to six heads or articles, was signed by thirteen archdeacons, a provost, and five deans. Although the number of assailants amounted to thirty-three, there were among them only fourteen proctors. The Church was saved by a majority consisting of the representatives of the parochial clergy, who were Anglo-Catholics—men not hostile to a reformation, who, after a time, accepted the title of Protestant to distinguish them from Puritans, but were as far removed from Calvinism as was possible.

The debate began on the 13th of February, when a warm discussion arose; but in the end it was found that a decided majority, being Anglo-Catholics, gave an indisputable though silent support to the archbishop, and resolutely refused to tamper any further with the offices of the Church. Even among the minority some Church feeling displayed itself, as might be expected. The reader will remember what has been remarked before, that among the Puritans there was a division; there were some who believed in the doctrine of Episcopacy, and on that account conformed, to the great disgust of the rest of the

CHAP.  
XI.

Matthew  
Parker.  
1559-75.

Church  
saved by  
Anglo-  
Catholics.



CHAP.  
XI.

Matthew  
Parker.

1559-75.

party. These now were true to their principles; or rather, we may say, their conduct on this occasion shows the justice of the distinction made; for they, while approving the suggestions of Bishop Sandys and his abettors, suggested that the matter in dispute should be relegated to the judgment of the bishops.

An attempt was made to convert the Articles, by their elongation, into a Confession of Faith; the minority being still resolute in their determination, if possible, to destroy the Church by sectarianizing it. In the fourth session of Convocation, the prolocutor appeared before the Upper House with the report of a committee which proposed the reconstruction of the Forty-two Articles of a former reign. It was proposed to effect this by a joint committee of the two Houses, whose report was to be submitted to the consideration of the whole Convocation.

The archbishop perceived, that their real object was to convert the Articles, intended merely to control the preachers within certain limits, into a Confession of Faith, which was to be obligatory upon every member of the Church; he must also have felt the more indignant because this was an attempt, as by a side wind, to obliterate his authority. With great calmness and dignity he administered a reproof: he pointed out to the prolocutor the irregularity of these proceedings; he informed him that the subject had already been brought before the Upper House, and he promised that, at a fitting time, the decision of their lordships should be communicated to the proctors and others of the Lower House.

The archbishop laid his draft of the Articles before his suffragans; and on the next day a discussion upon the subject began. The whole matter was carefully considered, the bishops sometimes, according to their convenience, meeting in Henry VII.'s Chapel, at other times in the Chapter

House of St. Paul's Cathedral. A correspondence was entered into with the Archbishop of the Northern Province; and on the 29th of January, the Thirty-nine Articles, as they have ever since been called, were unanimously accepted, and to the document which contained them the episcopal signatures were attached; the Archbishop of York and some of his suffragans being included among the signatories. The latter circumstance gives to this Convocation the character of a national synod.\*

CHAP.  
XI.

Matthew  
Parker.

1559-75.

Accept-  
ance of  
the Thirty-  
nine  
Articles.

The Articles were immediately transmitted to the Lower House, where it would appear that there was not the same willingness to subscribe as had been displayed in the Upper House. When a legal case is referred, and the referee in his decision gives satisfaction to neither party, it is said to be a sign that his judgment is impartial and just. We may presume on the impartiality with which the Thirty-nine Articles were drawn up, when we find that they were entirely acceptable to none of the parties into which the Church was split. Their sole object was to place restraint upon those who had no wish to be restrained. The Puritans were especially offended. The document containing the Articles was returned to the Upper House on the 5th of February, with only one hundred names attached to it. It was accompanied with a request that every member of the House should be required to subscribe it,—a request which seems to show that some coercion or moral persuasion was necessary.†

\* Synod. Anglic. 201. Cardwell's Synodalia, i. 36. These, together with Wilkins's vol. iv., are the chief authorities for the history of this important synod. See also Joyce's Hist. of English Synods, and his valuable notes.

† The document, with the signatures of both Houses of Convocation, was ordered to be left in the custody of the president of the Convocation, and by him was bequeathed to C. C. C., where it may be seen.

CHAP.  
XI.  
Matthew  
Parker.  
1559-75.

A larger list of subscribers was on the next day presented to the archbishop. Even after this there was a delay ; and the ratification of the Articles under the Great Seal did not take place till three years afterwards, that is to say, they were not received by the laity. The readiness of the Upper House to sign, proved that the bishops were aware that something must be done to restrain the licence of preachers ; the slowness of the Lower House to accept the Articles, evinced on their part an unwillingness to sacrifice their liberty.

What a synod has enacted, a synod may repeal ; and the question may still be mooted, whether the Articles are any longer necessary, or, if necessary, whether these Thirty-nine ought not to be amended. Admirably adapted they were in meeting the controversies of the sixteenth century ; but other Articles, if Articles are required, should be made to meet the heresies of the nineteenth century.

The draft of the Articles, as submitted to the Upper House of Convocation by the primate, had been slightly altered by his suffragans—the alterations, indeed, were so slight, that we may presume that they were simply intended to assert their right to correct the work of the metropolitan before they finally adopted it. These alterations may be seen in Cardwell's "Synodalia."

Into the controversy respecting the clause in the 20th Article, we are not in this place called upon to enter ; "The Church hath power to decree rites and ceremonies, and authority in controversies of faith." When a controversy arose upon the subject in a subsequent age, it is difficult to understand the object of those who would abscind this Article, or a portion of it ; for that portion of the disputed Article which relates to rites and ceremonies is sufficiently expressed in the 34th Article. But the Articles,

although a few years afterwards attached to the Church of England, are no more part of the Church of England than the limpet which clings to the rock is the rock itself. The Church of England existed hundreds of years before the Articles were drawn up, and in her reformation appealed to no articles of mere human authority, but to the Bible and the primitive Church.

At this Convocation Nowell's catechisms were introduced. Strype says that Nowell undertook to compose the catechisms on the advice of Sir William Cecil, but, as Dr. Cardwell observes, the letter on which Strype relies for this assertion does not, by any means, support the assertion.\* There is, however, no doubt that Dean Nowell endeavoured to enlist Sir William Cecil on his side; and in the letter to that statesman, referred to by Strype, the dean stated, that it was "a ground of complaint to persons beyond the seas," that the Church of England had no system of doctrine. "The opinion," wrote Nowell, "beyond the seas was, that nothing touching religion was with any authority or consent of any number of the learned here in our country taught and set forth; but that a few private persons taught and wrote opinions without the approbation of any authority at all." What Nowell condemned as a defect we now admire as an advantage.

It is probable that Cecil consulted the archbishop on the subject; it is certain that the minister was not persuaded by Nowell to rob the Church of its liberty, or to bind it by the trammels of a sect. Cecil was too acute not to be able to distinguish between a "Catechismus Puerorum" and a confession of faith professing to explain 'the whole counsel of God.' Parker had taught him

CHAP.  
XI.

Matthew  
Parker.

1559-75.

The Cate-  
chism.

\* Strype's Annals, I. i. 525; Cardwell's Documentary Annals, i. 300.



CHAP.

XI.

Matthew  
Parker.

1559-75.

that the tradition of the primitive Church, tested by the Bible, was sufficient for members of a Catholic Church; and if the Church of Rome, in Pope Pius's Catechism, or the Church of England, in the Thirty-nine Articles, fettered their teachers on certain disputed points, this did not interfere with our general liberty, and was only a temporary arrangement.

Archbishop Parker respected Nowell as a man, and probably expected to win him, like Jewel, to his purposes; at the same time, he exerted his influence silently but effectually to prevent his larger catechism from obtaining synodical authorization. Nowell boasted that his greater catechism had been favourably received by the members of Convocation, many of whom "altered it and underlined it with their remarks." He evidently alluded to the minority of thirty-three; but they only acted in their private capacity, or as men in debate before a decision was arrived at; for he admits and laments that he failed to obtain the authoritative sanction of the synod.\*

Owing to the destruction of the registers of the Convocation, we find it difficult to give a history of Nowell's catechism: we may be satisfied with expressing our deep sense of gratitude to the Merciful Providence which has exonerated us from a burden which it would have been difficult to sustain; for certainly the Church in its corporate capacity has no concern with the document. The larger catechism did not pass the two Houses in 1562-3. It was not published till 1570, and then, although accepted by the Lower House of Convocation, it did not pass the Upper House.† Of its failure no doubt can be entertained. One strong party in the country was always

\* Burghley MSS. vii. 9. See also Churton's *Life of Nowell*.

† *Synodus Anglicana*, 215. It was never sanctioned by the queen.

contending that it had synodical authority ; but by their opponents they were dared to the proof. The catechism is so completely forgotten now, that among well-informed divines it is scarcely known that it ever had existence ; a circumstance which would have been impossible if it had ever been adopted as a regular formulary of the Church.

Parker's conduct in the affair shows, that he could hardly determine how to proceed. The case was perplexing in the absence of precedent ; and the expression of the grounds of his hesitation to sanction it would have been impolitic and inexpedient. It was suppressed, however, till 1570, when it was published with a dedication to the archbishop—a concession which satisfied Nowell, and yet did not commit the Church.

It was Parker's policy, in this Convocation, to encourage a freedom of speech, so that our rulers in Church and State might become acquainted with the requirements of the Church and the wants of the clergy ; but, at the same time, he exerted himself to prevent legislation.

In addition to the matters already mentioned, the unsatisfactory state of the temporalities of the Church was taken into consideration, and inquiries were instituted, of an important character, upon the regulation of parishes. One measure was introduced with the object of regulating the leases both of bishops and of deans and chapters. Another Bill was brought in to regulate dilapidations ; another, that due inquiry should be made into the fitness of candidates who applied for confirmation. In the Upper House, the metropolitan urged his suffragans to be very circumspect in their choice of Scripture-readers—or lay helps, if we may give a modern designation to those who discharged the duties implied in that title. He was particular also in warning them against admitting to the diaconate those who continued to support their families

CHAP.  
XI.

Matthew  
Parker.

1559-75.

Freedom  
of speech  
encour-  
aged.

Tempo-  
ralities.

CHAP.  
XI.Matthew  
Parker.

1559-75.

Parker's  
opinion of  
Convoca-  
tion.

by remaining in trade. Literates were, of necessity, ordained when candidates from the Universities did not present themselves. It was ordered that no deacon should undertake an occupation for gain, who was provided with an income amounting to twenty nobles. This was simply an agreement among the bishops; for it is true, speaking generally, that at this Convocation no canons were passed.\*

On the 14th of April the synod broke up, to the evident relief of Parker's mind. What his feelings were on the subject is revealed to us in a letter to Sir William Cecil, preserved among the archbishop's manuscripts. It was written on the very day on which he was released from his duties as president of the Convocation; and after a conversation with the secretary on the results of the synod. "In consideration," he writes, "of yesternight's talk, calling to remembrance what the qualities of all my brethren be in reference of our Convocation societies, I see some of them to be *pleni rimarum, hac atque illac effluunt*, although indeed the queen's majesty may have good cause to be well contented with her choice of most of them, very few excepted, amongst whom I count myself. And furthermore, though we have done amongst ourselves little in our own cause, yet I assure you our mutual conferences have taught us such experiences, that I trust we shall all be the better in governance for hereafter. And when the queen's highness *doth note me to be too soft and easy*, I think divers of my brethren will rather note me, if they were asked, too sharp and too earnest in moderation, which towards them I have used, and will still do, till *mediocrity shall be received amongst us*. Though towards them *qui foris sunt* I cannot but

\* Strype's Annals, I. i. 508-512, 520, 521. Grindal, p. 100, 101. Burnet, III. i. 365. Wake, p. 603.



show civil affability, and yet, I trust, inclining to no great cowardness, to suffer wilful heads to escape too easily. *Sed ista parerga.*" \*

This letter is valuable, as throwing light on our great reformer's character. It reveals to us the principle which Parker adopted for the direction of his conduct; a principle from which, unfortunately for himself and the Church, he was too often led to deviate, from that desire to please all parties, which was sure in the end to give satisfaction to none. The letter also shows that the late synod was regarded as having ended favourably to the Anglo-Catholics—the men of peace as they then were—as was really the fact, the Puritans having been foiled in almost all their attempts to introduce their peculiarities. Parker did not desire a triumph for either party; his ambition was to unite the two great parties—the Anglo-Catholics and the Puritans—in one great school of thought. Under these circumstances he determined to address a pastoral to his suffragans, now returning to their dioceses, and he submitted the draft to the supervision of his friend Sir William Cecil. The draft is in the latter part so altered and interlined, that it is difficult to make out its exact meaning. In the letter eventually sent by the archbishop to his suffragans, the subject is brought clearly to light. After the usual formalities in the address, the archbishop thus proceeds: "This is upon good and deliberate considerations to require you, as also upon your obedience to charge, to have a grave, prudent, and godly respect in executing the Act of the establishment of the queen's authority over her ecclesiastical subjects, late passed in parliament." We here see his tenderness towards the Catholics, or the great body of conformists,

CHAP.  
XI.

Matthew  
Parker.

1559-75.

Pastoral of  
Parker to  
his suffra-  
gans.

\* Corresp. p. 173.



CHAP.  
XI.Matthew  
Parker.

1559-75.

especially among the clergy. Through the obstinacy of Archbishop Heath, and the prelates acting with him, the present bishops had been, of necessity, chosen from among the Puritans; and though their conformity implied the renunciation of some of the worst features of Puritanism, the archbishop evidently feared lest, in the intolerant spirit of the age, the bishops being invested with power, should so exercise it as to attempt to crush instead of seek to conciliate that party in the Church, which, though consisting of conformists, were more opposed to Geneva than to Rome. The oath of supremacy might be, at any time, insisted upon; but the policy of the archbishop and of the government, at this time, was not to press it upon those of the clergy who, disliking the oath, still remained in their cures, discharging in a meek and quiet spirit the duties of their calling. "If upon any very apparent cause," proceeds the archbishop, implying inaction and charitable allowance where such cause did not exist, "your lordship shall be, as it were compelled, for the wilfulness of some of that sort, to tender the oath mentioned in the Act, the peremptory refusal whereof shall endanger them in præmunire, that immediately upon such refusal of any person, ye do address your letters to me, expressing the disorders of such a one who is fallen into such danger, and ye proceed not to offer the said oath a second time, until your lordship shall have my answer returned to you in writing." He entreated his brethren not to misinterpret his intentions, or to regard him as the patron of a party, in which he admitted there were many who "bore a perverse stomach to the purity of Christ's religion;" but to regard him in this respect as only exhibiting "a pastoral care which must appear in us which be heads of the flock, not to follow our own private affections and heats, but to provide *coram Deo*

*et hominibus, for saving and winning of others if it may be so obtained.\**

CHAP.  
XI.

Matthew  
Parker.

1559-75.

We may be permitted here to renew our remark, that these letters and the proceedings of the government, at this time, are sufficient to show the error—leading sometimes to erroneous judgments in courts of law—of which they are guilty who represent the Protestant party as in the ascendant. They formed a minority, but a minority armed with power. An application from Bishop Jewel to the primate, whom he calls the “sacra anchora” to himself and others, for advice under a special circumstance, is interesting, as showing that it was clearly understood, that the Church being the same, after as well as before its reformation had begun, the laws were of necessity the same unless specially repealed, or by subsequent legislation rendered obsolete. The Bishop of Salisbury, John Jewel, writes thus: “The bearer hereof will exhibit to your grace a Roman dispensation *under lead* for one Harvee, prebendary of my church. I beseech your grace advertize me whether it will stand good in law or no, and whether the party may enjoy it, not having or using priestly apparel, but in all respects, going as a serving man or no.” What is more remarkable is, that from this letter we learn that the controversy still existing, on marriage with a deceased wife’s sister, engaged attention in the reign of Queen Elizabeth, and was a subject upon which our reformers had no very decided opinion. The bishop continues: “Chafin that hath married two sisters, upon his appeal from your grace and me, hangeth still upon the delegators, and, as much as I can perceive, is not likely to have any great hurt at their hands. *I would they would decree it were lawful to marry two sisters, so would the world be out of doubt.*”

\* Corresp. p. 174.

CHAP.  
XI.Matthew  
Parker.

1559-75.

From this time and for several years the Church continued to be governed by the archbishop, whose prerogatives as primate seem not to have been called into question or disputed. Convocation met several times, but little business of an ecclesiastical character was transacted. The Convocations were duly assembled, but were chiefly employed in granting subsidies to the crown.

Convoca-  
tion of  
1571.

When the career of Parker was drawing to a close, a wish prevailed, and to this he acceded, that a Convocation should be held for the despatch of business; and an important one took place in 1571. On this occasion the sermon was preached by no less a person than Whitgift; and Aylmer, at that time Archdeacon of Lincoln, was chosen prolocutor. Hitherto the bishops, acting under the connivance of the primate, had been lax in requiring subscription to the Thirty-nine Articles, to which, at first, the Puritans were quite as much opposed as the Anglo-Catholics. But the papists from abroad, and those among the Regulars who had, clandestinely or through the connivance of the government, retained their chaplaincies in the private chapels of certain members of the English aristocracy, were now plotting to disturb the peace of the realm, and although the majority of the Anglo-Catholics had been Protestantized, some of the older of the clergy were suspected of a secret inclination to listen to foreign and disloyal councils. At this Convocation, therefore, the Thirty-nine Articles were read, confirmed, and signed by both Houses; and every bishop was supplied with a sufficient number to take down into their respective dioceses, there to obtain the signatures of the clergy—of the clergy alone, because the Articles were intended, not as an exposition of doctrine to the Church at large, but as a direction to the clergy only. No clergyman was to be licensed as a preacher by his bishop until

he had subscribed to the Articles. So unpopular, however, were the Articles, and this whole proceeding, that by some writers, the year 1571 is termed *the woful year of Subscription*.

CHAP.  
XI.  
Matthew  
Parker.  
1559-75.

In the Upper House of Convocation of 1571, under Parker's direction, a book of canons was arranged and settled under the following title: *Liber quorundam Canonum disciplinæ Ecclesiæ Anglicanæ*, but for some cause or other, not explained, it was not laid before the Lower House. These canons were observed, however, by the bishops in the management of their several dioceses; and no objection was raised against them on the ground of any want of authority—the ancient tradition of episcopal authority still prevailing. The queen especially stated, that she regarded the authority of the bishops as sufficient, and considered that the Lower House was included in the decisions of the Upper.\* That the Thirty-nine Articles, while chaining the clergy, or not permitting them to move beyond a certain tether, were not regarded as obligatory upon the English Church, is sufficiently apparent from the fact, that the very same Convocation which required clerical subscription to the Articles, declared, under the head *De Concionatoribus*, that nothing was to be taught as matter of faith religiously to be observed but that which was agreeable to the Old and New Testaments, and collected out of the same doctrine—not by the reformers, but by the ancient fathers and Catholic bishops of the Church.

Catholi-  
cism of the  
English  
Church.

This was a concession made to the archbishop and to the English reformers generally, for they had been subjected to some mortifications by the determined opposition still shown against Church principles, by a powerful minority in the Lower House.

\* Strype, ii. 60.



CHAP.  
XI.Matthew  
Parker.

1559-75.

It will be remembered, that in the reign of Henry VIII. a committee had been appointed to reform the ecclesiastical law. Until this committee should complete its work, it was enacted that the old Catholic canons should continue to be, as they had long been, and still are, the canons of the Church of England, provided that they were not contrary to the statutes of the realm or the prerogatives of the crown.

These reformers of the canons had completed their work, or nearly so, when Edward VI. died; and owing to that event, it had not been confirmed by parliament or accepted by the crown. The subject was again brought before the parliament of 1571. But the queen and the archbishop, true to their principle of not disconnecting the present from the past, presented a tacit but effectual opposition to the measure, and consequently for these canons parliamentary authority was never obtained. The Church of England is still governed by the canons in vogue during the centuries which preceded the reformation of the Church; and Archbishop Tait, except where the statute law has interposed, is as much bound by the ancient canons as was Thomas à Becket and his successors.

Convoca-  
tion of  
1572.

The Convocation of 1572 has to us a peculiar interest, since to it were addressed the last words of Matthew Parker.

This Convocation opened with the usual solemnities and ceremonial; the sermon was preached by Dr. Young, one of the residentiaries of St. Paul's Cathedral, on the 9th of May; the representatives of the clergy, the dignitaries of the Church, and the law officers in the archbishop's courts being duly assembled.

When the Convocation met the next day for business, the Lower House was summoned into the presence of his grace the president, and the heart must have been hard

that remained unmoved. The aged primate, unable to stand, addressed the two Houses from his seat : he sat, bowed down by a premature old age, oppressed with many infirmities, and suffering under a mortal and most painful complaint. However violently some were opposed to him on principle, yet he had "borne his faculties meekly ;" and although, being a man without enthusiasm, he was not likely to enkindle enthusiastic feelings among his supporters, there were few present who had not experienced some act of consideration or kindness at his hands ; or, if they had been subjected to the discipline of the Church, administered by him, they could not but have felt, when they looked back with calmness to the past, that they were indebted to him for the forbearance which was ever ready to abstain from the unnecessary annoyance of those who set his authority at defiance, or who even refused obedience to the laws of the realm and the canons of the Church.

Everyone, he said, must be aware that he had been commanded by the queen to convene, and those whom he addressed to attend, this synod, for the furtherance of some salutary end and object to the Church of Christ. The assembly had been opened the preceding day by tendering their homage to the Majesty of Heaven, and they had heard from a man of piety and learning an exhortation replete with erudition and sound advice. Having made such a good beginning, they might fairly expect that the rest of their labours would be brought to a happy termination. If zeal in the propagation and preservation of Christ's religion were the duty of all in their several stations, he reminded the members of the synod, that, in consideration of their orders and of the dignity of their office, they ought not only to surpass all others in their zeal and vigilance, but that they should be prepared,

CHAP.  
XI.Matthew  
Parker.

1559-75.

Parker's  
address to  
the synod.

CHAP.

XI.

Matthew  
Parker.

1559-75.

if need should be, to sacrifice to the great cause their good name, their worldly goods, yea, even life itself. They were set apart by the Lord, and warned by the Holy Spirit to search the deep things of God, and to make his will known to the people. They had their ancestors for an example ; not only those who of late, having investigated the truth, confirmed it by a martyr's death, but those also in the apostolic age, of whose piety and success in this island of ours many memorials still remain. Although of their works some had been destroyed by Anti-Christ, and others damaged by long desuetude, yet much had been handed down to the present more enlightened age ; proving abundantly that our orders and the ceremonies retained by us are in perfect accordance with their institutions. Especially dear to us ought to be what emanated from our predecessors in the Church of England.

He then went on to say, that even if the ancient traditions, which he so much valued, had failed, they were so fortunate as still to possess the original Scriptures, in Hebrew and Greek, upon which to fall back ; and then by quotations from St. Cyprian and from St. Basil the Great, he showed, that it was the primitive custom, by a reference to the sacred Scriptures, to test the traditional practices of the Church, and to prevent them from degenerating into superstition.

He enlarged on the principles on which the Reformation should be conducted in England—a deference to traditional religion, all education being, in fact, a tradition from father to son—corrected by a reference to the original Scriptures : so that our religion does not depend upon a single book, though we possess an inspired volume, to instruct us when and where, through the lapse of time and the wiles of Satan, the religion we have inherited has degenerated into superstition, as was seen to be the case

until, by the printing press, the tradition as well as the Scriptures of the Church had been stereotyped.

Having laid before them the principles of the English Reformation, he left it to the members of the Convocation and to persons of greater leisure than he himself possessed, to enlarge upon them; and he confined himself to the business more immediately before them.

In order that their debates might be conducted without confusion, and that due order might be preserved in their proceedings, he should himself preside over the Upper House; and he directed, that on the following Wednesday, the Lower House, having elected a prolocutor, should present him to the president, in order that he might obtain his grace's sanction.

On the day appointed Dr. Whitgift was elected prolocutor. It was evident that it had been the intention of the government, that this Convocation should proceed to the transaction of business; but some cause or other, probably the primate's ill-health, terminating in his death three years after, presented an impediment, and very little business of real importance was accomplished.

CHAP.  
XI.

Matthew  
Parker.  
1559-75.



## CHAPTER XII.

## CONTROVERSIES.

Party government.—Vestment controversy.—The principle of Elizabeth's Government.—Reformation of an old Church, not the establishment of a Protestant sect.—Elizabeth's ecclesiastical policy.—Two-thirds of clergy and laity were Anglo-Catholics.—Concessions made on both sides.—Bishop Gheast's letter on the Eucharist.—Diversities of practice.—Bad taste of the Puritans.—Persecution of Parker.—His life threatened.—Mandate of the queen to the primate and his suffragans to enforce uniformity.—Vacillation of the queen.—Earl of Leicester; his evil influence with the queen.—A profligate man though the leader of the Puritans.—Parker's employment of the press.—Foreign theologians consulted.—Parker's misunderstanding with the queen.—Change of opinion in Jewel and others.—The attack nominally on vestments, in reality on Episcopacy.—Puritans discovered Anti-Christ in the Church of England.—Royal Commission.—Controversy with Sampson and Humphrys.—Parker's generosity to his opponents.—Disturbances in London churches.—Eucharist profaned.—Clergy in surplices mobbed.—Insults offered to the archbishop's chaplains.—Forms observed in celebrating.—London clergy cited before the Ecclesiastical Commissioners.—Addressed by the Chancellor.—Licences for preaching revoked and renewed.—Papal privileges asserted at Cambridge.—Parker's success.—Character of the English Reformation.—Peter Heylin, Wolfgang Musculus.—Establishment of Anglo-Romanism in opposition to Anglo-Catholicism.—Excommunication of Elizabeth by the Pope.—Establishment of Protestant Dissent.—Thomas Cartwright.—Opposition to Episcopacy.—All Church principles denied *seriatim*.—Romish dissent not formally established before the time of Cardinal Wiseman.—Puritan schism established at Wandsworth.—Troubles towards the close of Parker's life.—Parliament of 1571.—Bitter

feeling of the Puritan members against the bishops and the Church.—Violence of Strickland.—Peter Wentworth.—Precisians.—Brownists.—Propheysings.—Earl of Sussex.—Visitation of the Isle of Wight.—Parker insulted at Court.—His angry letter.

It is proposed in the present chapter to bring under one point of view, the more prominent of those controversies in which Matthew Parker was involved. They incidentally throw light on his character, as well as on the history of the age in which he played so distinguished a part.

The difficulties he had to encounter, or rather the manner in which they were to be met, differed considerably from the difficulties and the consequent controversies by which the angry passions of modern polemics are excited and the critical judgment of opposing parties are called into action at the present time. By the system of party government, which has gradually risen up among us, the co-operation of independent thinkers can now be secured; and mutual concessions are found to be admissible, without any sacrifice of that freedom of mind in regard to general principles, through which a combination of friends is distinguishable from the submission of slaves to the will of a superior whose object is not to lead but to domineer. We can now understand how, in selecting a leader, we make choice of a *primus inter pares*, with whom on all great principles we agree; and to whom, in the minor details necessary for the carrying out of a great design, we are willing to defer. We only separate, when, in the carrying out of our details we discover a difference in what relates to a vital principle.

Very different was it in Parker's time: at that period the sovereign ruled as well as reigned; and Elizabeth was, in fact, her own prime minister. The other ministers were merely the heads of departments. Between the

CHAP.  
XII.

Matthew  
Parker.

1559-75.

Party  
govern-  
ment.

CHAP.  
XII.  
Matthew  
Parker.  
1559-75.

heads of the various departments there was not, of necessity, any union of opinion ; and, instead of seeking to act together for the good of all, each minister thought only of the course to be by him pursued, to win the approbation or retain the confidence of the queen. The queen herself was sometimes jealous, lest, through a good understanding between her most trusted ministers, her own power should be overlooked, and she become, instead of a dictator, a mere puppet in the hands of men who owed their official position to her discernment or favour.

The difficulties which a minister had to encounter, when called upon to act under such conditions, were so great as to become sometimes insuperable. When a minister had done his best, he might be thwarted by a favourite, who, also a minister, was known to be seeking, not the public good, but his own aggrandizement. There could be no unity of action between the ministers except such as arose from private friendship ; and, what was worse, there was no security of support from the crown, except when the royal mind was awakened to a sense of the dangers which beset the state. On great occasions and emergencies, Elizabeth had the wisdom to see that she must have a master-mind on which to rely,—and all her subordinate ministers were therefore aware, that if they desired to carry any great measure within their own department, they would do wisely to consult Cecil before approaching the queen ; although the queen would sometimes act in opposition even to Cecil's advice, merely—or chiefly—in the fear, that if his advice were invariably followed, he would become *de facto* king.

All these things must be taken into consideration, when we sit in judgment upon Parker in regard to his administration of ecclesiastical affairs, and to his proceedings when conducting the reformation of his Church. He

could not do all he wished, and he was, therefore, content to save from the general wreck what he could.

The great controversy which disturbed the peace, and distracted the mind of Parker during the first years of his episcopate, related to the vestments of the clergy. When men are determined to quarrel, the devil will soon find a pretext for the controversy. Under evil influence, the quarrel has, of late years, been revived, and Protestant associations, so called, are established for the persecution of those who would retain the sacerdotal vestments. To many persons, viewing the subject from without, the controversy appears to be perfectly puerile; but, although it is, comparatively speaking, easy to excite the malignant passions of the ignorant, whether in high life or in low life, and although human, even diabolical, passions may be misrepresented as Christian zeal, still it is quite possible that, under the superincumbent mass of puerility, an important principle or a holy sentiment may lie buried.

Of the real merits of the "vestiarian controversy," as it existed in the first years of the Reformation, only a few thoughtful persons could then, or can now, decide. The impassioned multitude might understand their fanatical leaders, when they declaimed against the government for disturbing the peace of society, by insisting that the English clergy should still retain, under certain modifications, those vestments in which for several centuries the clergy of the Church of England had been accustomed to officiate. They did not perceive, or they would not admit, that if folly there were, that folly was not confined to one party; it was shared by those who refused obedience to the ecclesiastical rulers "sitting in Moses' seat," and succeeding to the authority of the Apostles. Especially was this the case when, as in the case under

CHAP.  
XII.

Matthew  
Parker.

1559-75

Vesture  
contro-  
versy.



CHAP.  
XII.Matthew  
Parker.

1559-75.

Conces-  
sions not  
to have  
regard to  
one party  
only.

consideration, they were acting in obedience to the laws of the land and the requirements of the Church. The ancient vestments had, in many respects, become incommodious, and were open to various objections; but this was not the case with all. It was determined by our ecclesiastical rulers to reform, but not to destroy. The determination not to destroy was consistent with the resolution at which the queen and her government had arrived, of connecting the present with the past. They continually bore in mind, that they were reforming the old Church, not establishing a new sect; and on this principle, they so ordered the Church, that, in small things as well as in great, the people should be reminded of the fact. Having liberated the Church from the tyranny of the Bishop of Rome, Queen Elizabeth was by no means prepared to hold the stirrup to a pope of Geneva; or, like the Puritans, to invest Calvin with the pretensions of infallibility.

The soundness of Elizabeth's policy may be controverted, but if we accept her scheme of reform as a dictate of wisdom, we are not justified in blaming the queen for not yielding to the Puritans; when, in opposing details, they were consciously aiming a blow at her known principle of action. What was theoretically right or wrong she left it to her clergy to discuss and determine; what she, as the ruler of the nation, had to do, when a determination had been arrived at by the hierarchy, by the Convocation, and by the parliament, was to compel her subjects to obey the law: obedience she required, because she desired to promote the peace of the country. In order to effect this object, she understood that concessions must be made: but they were to be made not to one party only; for she was perfectly aware, that if there was a powerful minority among her subjects who thought that she had not gone,

Conces-  
sions made  
to both  
parties.

in the work of reformation, far enough, there was another party which, if not so deeply read, was certainly more numerous, whose opinion was, that she had gone too far. She could not forget the re-action which had followed the Puritan excesses in the reign of her brother; neither could she conceal from herself the fact, that among the majority who enjoyed the benefices of the Church, there were not a few who might, if provoked, be led to give their support to the Queen of Scots. Elizabeth knew full well, that it was not as the head of a faction, whether papal or puritan, but as the queen of a great country, that she ought to present herself to her people. The opposite mode of proceeding had been the ruin of her sister. By the short-sighted policy of the foreign powers acting in the interests of the Bishop of Rome, Elizabeth was compelled, against her inclinations, to win the support of the Puritans by making to them large concessions; but these concessions must terminate somewhere, and where could she better make her stand than upon a point which appeared to politicians to be either childish or factious?

The line of policy which for ten or twelve years, in a controversial age, prevented a rupture between Church and state, if not always to be approved, is surely not to be contemned. It is observed by Neal, the Puritan historian, that "the services performed in the queen's chapel and in sundry cathedrals were so splendid and showy, that foreigners could not distinguish it from the Roman, except that it was performed in the English tongue." He says, that "by this method most of the *popish* laity were deceived into conformity and came regularly to church for nine or ten years, till the pope, being out of all hopes of an accommodation, forbid them, by excommunicating the queen and laying the whole nation under an interdict." In this passage we have an

CHAP.  
XII.

Matthew  
Parker.

1559-75.

Elizabeth's  
successful  
policy.

CHAP.  
XII.

Matthew  
Parker.

1559-75.

instance of the manner in which a party historian, by giving to his statements a false colouring, and by using consciously an incorrect term, can leave an erroneous impression upon the reader's mind, and lead him blindfolded into heresy. If Neal had spoken of the members of the Church as being *Anglo-Catholic*, thus distinguishing them from the Romanenses, Romanists, or Papists, he would in his assertion have been correct. Upon the conforming Anglo-Catholics, the Bishop of Rome, as it was the custom to style the pope, could make no impression; and therefore it was, that after a season of quiescence, his patience being exhausted, he sent a mission of Romanists into the kingdom. Soames, who quotes this passage, makes the remark, that the parties whom the Puritan uncharitably affirms were "deceived into conformity," consisted of *two-thirds of the nation*, and possessed an immense preponderance of its wealth.\* They *were* Catholics—Anglo-Catholics; they were *not* papists; though it is possible that they would prefer popery to Puritanism.

Neal also asserts, that the instructions given by the queen's government to the ecclesiastical commissioners, was "to strike out all offensive passages against the pope, and to make people easy about the corporal presence." The historian, in his ignorance or his prejudice, uses the word *corporal*, which our reformers did *not* use, although they *did* speak of the *real* presence of Our Blessed Lord in the Holy Sacrament. He complains, that while large concessions were thus made to the Anglo-Catholics, not a single word was uttered in favour of those Puritans whom he describes as "the stricter Protestants." "She was desirous to retain," he says, "images in churches, crosses and crucifixes, vocal and instrumental music, with

\* Elizabethan History, p. 9.

all the old popish garments. The rubric that declared, that by kneeling at the Sacrament no adoration was intended to any corporal presence of Christ, was expunged." Such was the Church of England as our first reformers left her, and such she continued to be in all her broad features, until the great rebellion annihilated those ancient traditions by which the Prayer Book could be best interpreted.

The Anglo-Catholics, out of whom sprang the school of divines of which the judicious Hooker is the representative and type, had submitted to much injustice, and in spite of various attempts to stir them up to acts of sedition and rebellion, they remained firm in their loyalty to the queen. Without entirely approving the powers she claimed or asserted, they supported the queen's government in her determination to disavow the encroachments and exactions of the papal see, to reform the ecclesiastical courts, and to uphold the independence of their country. It would have been a wanton act of tyranny to have refused to them all toleration of those observances which were so dear to their hearts, simply to gratify the Puritan, who was too often excited by mere feelings of intolerance and party zeal. To do justice to the government, we must repeat the statement, that there were two extremes, to whom it was necessary to pay equal attention. If it were difficult to compel the Puritan to wear the surplice, it was equally difficult to persuade the Anglo-Catholics—that is, the majority of conformists—to lay aside the cope. It was easy to *claim* concessions on the one side or the other, but on neither side was it easy to *make* them, so hard it is τυχεῖν τοῦ μέσου.

CHAP.  
XII.

Matthew  
Parker.

1559-75.

That there was an honest, and, for a short time, a successful, attempt to deal fairly with all parties, will be apparent to such persons as will consult the injunctions,

Conces-  
sions both  
to the  
Catholic  
and Puri-  
tan parties.



CHAP.  
XII.Matthew  
Parker.

1559-75.

the advertisements, the royal letters, and the other public documents issued in the early part of Elizabeth's reign.

But the government was always under the influence of fear rather than of love. Fearing, at one time, the Puritans, it endeavoured to obtain concessions from the Catholics ; and then, when the seminary priests and Jesuits made their appearance in England, the government, taking alarm in the opposite direction, adopted severe political measures which gave sufficient ground to its assailants for the assertion, that the Catholics had been treated with unjust harshness. Had the authorities in Church and state been sufficiently powerful to carry out their political schemes to a successful issue, the Reformation in this country would have been, if not more impartial, yet certainly more complete.

Acts of  
Parliament  
anti-papal,  
but Ca-  
tholic.

The archbishop avowed his determination to abide by two Acts that had been passed in the late parliament, introduced probably at his own suggestion. By the first the Court of Faculties was instituted, to which attention will be hereafter more particularly called ; an Act which removed the granting of dispensations and licences from the papal court to the court of the Archbishop of Canterbury.

We have here to remark, that the Papists, or persons holding extreme opinions on the Catholic side, had long before quitted the country ; and to this enactment the remaining secular clergy were not, speaking generally, opposed.

The nineteenth clause of the second of the two statutes, to which reference is here made, contained the statutory declaration, that it was never intended to drive the Church of England into an *uncatholic* or *sectarian* position.\*

\* 25 Henry VIII. cap. 21 ; 28 Henry VIII. cap. 19.

The reformation of a colony of Christ's kingdom divinely instituted was seen to be very different from the establishment of a sect of human origin.

It was expressly declared, that it was not the purpose of the sovereign or of the parliament, any more than of the Convocation, "to decline or vary from the congregation of Christ's flock in anything concerning the very articles of the Catholic faith of Christendom."

At various times the queen expressed her resolution, not only to uphold the Catholic principles of the Church, but also to extend her favour beyond the immediate demands of justice to all her subjects who should conduct themselves with loyalty and discretion.

A declaration was made by the queen so late as in the year 1570, in which, not long before the demise of Parker, she indirectly declared her approbation of his policy in Church affairs. This was long had in remembrance, and was frequently quoted—by her friends, to prove the liberality of her sentiments; and by her enemies, to charge her with inconsistency of conduct.

She declared, "that she would have all her loving subjects to understand, that so far as they shall openly continue in the observance of her laws, and shall not wilfully and manifestly break them by their open actions, her majesty's meaning was not to have any of them molested by any examination or inquisition of their consciences in causes of religion, but will accept and treat them as her good subjects." \*

It is interesting, almost amusing, to see how in the government measures an attempt was often made to balance the concessions as they were granted first to one side, then to the other. The statements are antithetical;

CHAP.  
XII.

Matthew  
Parker.

1559-75.

Catho-  
licism of  
the Church  
of Eng-  
land.

Policy of  
govern-  
ment.

A balance  
of conces-  
sions.

\* Annals, I. ii. 372.

CHAP.  
XII.Matthew  
Parker.

1559-75.

and some of them will here be presented to the reader, because they show the animus of the archbishop, whose wise measures were eventually frustrated by the weakness of his successor in the see of Canterbury.\*

A bible of the largest size was ordered to be placed in the parish churches, and every facility was offered to the public for the perusal of the sacred volume ; at the same time, in accordance with the Church principles already noticed, each parish was to be provided with the paraphrases of Erasmus, a Catholic whose mind was in keeping, certainly not with the foreign, but rather with the English Reformation ; more of a reformer than he had the courage to affirm or admit, but still a Catholic.

Preaching—the one great ordinance of Puritanism—was encouraged, but only those among the clergy were allowed to preach who were duly licensed by the primates. If the Anglo-Catholics had ground of complaint, that, to please the Puritans, many edifying ceremonies were abolished, and useful observances discontinued, the Puritan, on the other hand, became liable to condign punishment if he should maliciously neglect or violate the rites or ordinances still retained and by public authority appointed to be observed. The Puritans maligned the priests, and regarded their ministers simply in the light of preachers ; but the people were required to bear in mind, that the priestly office or function was a divine appointment, and they were directed accordingly to treat the priests with due respect. To secure this end, the clergy were required to appear in public in the usual dress of the priesthood ; wearing those square caps, against

\* The reader is referred to the Injunctions of 1559, to the Advertisements, to the Royal Letters, and other public documents for the various statements made above.

which the Puritans entertained an unaccountable antipathy.

Indeed, both parties were admonished to abstain from "convicious words" as applied to their opponents. The Anglo-Catholics were prohibited from reviling the Puritans as heretics, schismatics, sacramentaries, and such like; while the Puritans were warned against defaming the opposite party as popish or papistical. Although in parish churches the Common Prayer was to be pronounced in a language "understood by the people," yet in the universities and public schools the Latin Prayer Book was permitted, and chanting was everywhere enjoined; the Litany and prayers were to be sung, and provision was to be made for the study and cultivation of music. In spite of the denunciations of Puritanism, the organ and the anthem still pealed through the vaulted aisles of our cathedrals and larger churches, and priests officiated in their surplices and copes. Although the stone altars were removed and replaced by communion tables, yet the old form of words in the administration of the Holy Sacrament, which had been erased in King Edward's Second Book, was now restored. A rubric which seemed to make a question of the Real Presence was expunged; and although common bread was tolerated, the use of the wafer was recommended by the primate and the Bishop of London, and was generally used in the churches. On the communion table itself, two lights were permitted to stand, for the "significance that Christ is the true light of the world."

Although many medieval observances in the administration of baptism had been, to the regret of the Anglo-Catholics, discontinued, yet, to the disgust of the Puritans, the cross was still retained; as was also the ring in marriage, against which the Dissenters protested, as an

CHAP.  
XII.

Matthew  
Parker.

1559-75.



CHAP.  
XII.  
Matthew  
Parker.  
1559-75.

intolerable superstition. Adoration towards the Lord's table was encouraged. The feelings of our reformers with respect to ceremonial worship is proved by the retention or restoration of ceremonies on those public occasions to which the people in general were not admitted. Most of the ancient religious ceremonies observed by the Knights of the Garter, which had been abolished by King Edward VI., were restored by Queen Elizabeth to the condition in which they had stood in her father's time. Things, indeed, were so well arranged in St. George's Chapel, that foreign grandees who were admitted to the Order were not offended by certain omissions in the ceremonial ; while at the same time, the Protestant princes did not complain that their prejudices were shocked. Nothing proved more clearly the *via media* of the Reformation. Returning to parochial worship, we may observe, that although processions were reduced in number, yet, out of regard to old Catholic customs, which Puritans "maliciously" delighted to set at naught, it was expressly ordered, that in prayer, "All manner of people should devoutly and humbly kneel upon their knees ; and that whenever the name of the Lord Jesus should be, in any sermon, lecture, or otherwise in church pronounced, due reverence should be made with lowness of courtsey and uncovering of the heads of the man kind, as thereunto doth necessarily belong and heretofore hath been accustomed."

On the subject of the Holy Eucharist, Parker had not been involved to the extent of his immediate predecessors, Dr. Cranmer and Cardinal Pole ; but we have his opinion, and an important one it is, in a letter addressed by his friend Dr. Gheast, Bishop of Rochester, to Sir William Cecil. Gheast was, as we have seen, inclined to yield on the point of the ceremonies, though he observed them himself, and caused them to be observed by others.

There were, perhaps, other points of difference between him and Parker, but they were united in their opinion on this sacred subject. Bishop Gheast's judgment was authoritative, because, in drawing up the Thirty-nine Articles, it is known that the 28th article is to be traced to his pen. So important, indeed, is this letter as an ecclesiastical document connected with the reformation of the English Church, that it shall be presented to the reader *in extenso*. It is dated December 22, 1566 :—

CHAP.  
XII.

Matthew  
Parker.  
1559-75.

“ Greeting in the Lord.

“ Right Honourable,—I am very sorry that you are so sick : God make you whole ; as it is my desire and prayer. I would have seen you ere this, according to my duty and good-will ; but when I sent to know whether I might see you, it was oftentimes answered that you were not to be spoken with.

“ I suppose you have heard how the Bishop of Gloucester found himself grieved with the placing of this adverb—only—in this article : ‘ The Body of Christ is given, taken, and eaten in the Supper after an heavenly and spiritual manner only,’—because it did take away the Presence of Christ’s Body in the Sacrament ; and privately noted me to take his part therein, and yesterday, in my absence, more plainly vouched me for the same.

“ Whereas, between him and me, I told him plainly that this word ‘ only ’ in the aforesaid article did not exclude the Presence of Christ’s Body from the Sacrament, but only the grossness and sensibleness in the receiving thereof ; for I said unto him, though he take Christ’s Body in his hand, received it with his mouth, and that corporally, naturally, really, substantially, and carnally, as the doctors do write, yet did he not, for all that, see It, feel It, smell It, or taste It.

“ And, therefore, I told him I would speak against him

CHAP.  
XII.

Matthew  
Parker.

1559-75.

herein, and the rather because the article was of my own penning. And yet I would not, for all that, deny anything that I had spoken for the Presence. And this was the sum of our talk. And this that I said is so true by all sorts of men, that even Dr. Hardinge writeth the same, as it appeareth most evidently by his words reported in the Bishop of Salisbury's book, page 325, which be these: 'Then we may say that in the Sacrament His very Body is Present; yea, really; that is to say, in deed, substantially; that is, in substance, and corporally, carnally, and naturally;' by which words is meant, that His very Body, His very Flesh, and His very Human Nature is there, not after corporal, carnal, or natural-wise, but invisibly, unspeakably, supernaturally, spiritually, divinely, and by way unto Him only known.

"This I thought good to write unto your honour for my own purgation.

"The Almighty God in Christ restore you to your old health, and long keep you in the same, with increase of virtue and honour.

"Yours whole to his poor power,

"EDM. ROFFENS.

"To the Right Honourable, and his singular good Friend,

"Sir William Cecil, Knight,

"Principal Treasurer to the Queen's Majesty."

The good intentions of the queen and her government in this line of policy were frustrated by the violence of that party spirit which was, in the affairs of religion, as rancorous in the sixteenth century as, alas! it still too often is in the nineteenth. A suspicion of the truth, that the civil authorities shrunk from a recourse to extreme measures, gave courage even to the timid, and many there were who took pleasure in defying the

government, and in perplexing the advisers of the crown. In the country parishes things went on much as usual, and Elizabeth's government was popular, because, through the peace of the realm, the cultivators of the soil could enjoy the fruits of their industry. There the "old Catholics" were tacitly habituating themselves to those changes in the Ritual, which led them on to a love of the Prayer Book. Not so the towns. In the activity of town life there was a love of excitement and controversies were bitter, the Puritans being in the ascendant. It became evident that the Puritans would not be contented unless they could oust the Anglo-Catholics—that is, two-thirds of the clergy without counting the laity—from the Church; and the annihilation of Puritanism became, in a spirit of retaliation, the object of the papists. Instead of conciliating, both parties were bent upon exasperation; so that at length Cecil, acting on the advice of Parker, called the queen's attention to the incongruous manner in which the services of the Church were performed in the metropolis, in the following document:—

"Some perform divine service and prayers in the chancel, others in the body of the church; some in a seat made in the church; some in the pulpit, with their faces to the people; some keep precisely to the order of the book, others intermix psalms in metre; some officiate with a surplice, and others without it.

"In some places the table stands in the body of the church, in others it stands in the chancel; in some places it stands altar-wise distant from the wall a yard, in others it stands in the middle of the chancel north and south; in some places the table is joined, in others it stands upon tressels; in some the table has a carpet, in others none.

"Some administer the communion with surplice and

CHAP.  
XII.

Matthew  
Parker.

1559-75.



CHAP.  
XII.Matthew  
Parker.

1559-75.

cap, some with surplice alone, some with neither ; some with chalice, others with communion cup ; some with unleavened bread, others with leavened ; some receive kneeling, others standing, others sitting ; some baptize in a font, others in a basin ; some sign with the sign of the cross, others make no sign ; some administer in a surplice, others without ; some with a square cap, some with a round cap ; some with a button cap, some with a hat ; some in scholars' clothes, some in others."

That this is a partial statement is clear, for we might say the same of the practice of the Church in the nineteenth century : it would not be wholly false, and yet it would only be partially true. From this statement we see, however, that the controversy had already begun to change its ground. It was no longer merely a strife about images, crucifixes, chasubles, and copes ; these were beginning to be lost sight of in the zeal against the cap, the surplice, the tippet, and the wafer bread.\*

The Anglo-Catholics, secure in their majority, were still quiescent. The Puritans were the assailants ; but in the country parishes they caused as yet but little disturbance.

In the towns, the Puritans were now clamouring for the abolition of the episcopal function, if not of its name ; for the abolition of set forms of prayer, and of the sacramentals of the Church. They retained, indeed, as their sects still do, the name of Sacraments, as applicable to two ordinances, although, in their estimation, Baptism and the Supper of the Lord are denuded of that special grace attached to them severally by the Catholic Church.

The reader will remember to have been shocked at the application of ridicule, in sacred polemics, by the myrmidons of Crumwell. A better spirit was now manifested, but the bad taste was not entirely extinguished.

We have an instance of it in the case of the Dean of

\* See Zurich Letters, i. 133.

Wells, Dr. Turner—one of the most obnoxious and irreverent of his party.

A wretched man in the city of Wells was convicted of adultery. He was prosecuted in the Dean's Court, and sentenced to an open penance in the cathedral. A large congregation assembled, and the criminal was seen issuing from the vestry arrayed in the cast-off robes of a priest. Turner's profane jocosity was exhibited against the episcopate on another occasion. The dean was in the habit of calling bishops "*white coats*" and "*tippet gentlemen*." "Who gave them," he would ask, "more authority over me than I have over them, to forbid me preaching, or to deprive me—unless it be from their holy father the pope?" The Bishop of Bath and Wells, Dr. Gilbert Berkley, first remonstrated with the unhappy man, in private, on the impropriety of his conduct, and then admonished him publicly. The dean acted consistently on his own principles, for he first ridiculed the bishop in the deanery, and then denounced his orders from the pulpit.

Turner, who was a humourist, educated a pet dog—and a wonderful dog he was. He was taught a variety of tricks, as a bishop travelling through Wells experienced. A certain bishop having called upon Dr. Turner, was invited to partake of the decanal hospitality, and to meet a few friends at dinner. The dinner was served, and to the bishop was assigned the place of honour at the head of the table. To his well-instructed puritan dog the dean merely said "The bishop sweats," and straightway, rushing at his lordship, the dog seized his square cap, and bringing it to his master, received his approbation, and had his share of the luxuries of the table.

It would have been pardonable if things had not proceeded further than this poor joke; but every attempt was made to lower the English reformers—or, as the

CHAP.  
XII.

Matthew  
Parker.

1559-75.

Dr. Turner.

Persecu-  
tion of  
Parker by  
the Puri-  
tans.

CHAP.  
XII.

Matthew  
Parker.

1559-75.

party styled them, the Court Reformers—in public estimation. The learned men to whom we are indebted for the reformation of the Manual and Missal, and so for the establishment of the Book of Common Prayer, were reputed or misrepresented as a papistical, or, at the best, as a “Lutherano-papistical” ministry.\* Archbishop Parker had not only these hard names to bear, but he was called “Matthew meal-mouthe,” and also a “linsey-woolsey bishop.” The archbishop was sometimes alarmed lest an attempt should be made upon his life.

Aware of his timidity, the Puritans, through anonymous letters, amused themselves, at one time, by playing on the simplicity of the primate’s steward, who warned his master, that there was a determination to take off by poison, or otherwise, reformers whose scheme of reform had not descended to puritanism. That Parker was alarmed, and that many persons believed that some such attempt upon the lives of our leading men would be made, there can be no doubt; but although a person was prosecuted under circumstances of strong suspicion, the impartial reader will, perhaps, if he thinks fit to examine the subject, come to the conclusion, that the object of the conspirators was rather to terrify, than to murder the archbishop.

The alleged conspiracy did not take place until many years had elapsed; but it is mentioned here, that the reader may have in mind the alarms to which Parker was

\* Zurich Letters, i. 177; ii. 143. Gualter, in a letter to Beza, bearing date July 23, 1556, speaks of the English reformers, as wolves, papists, Lutherans, Sadducees, and Herodians. Ibid. ii. 125. Reference is made to these passages, and they might be multiplied, to show, what is frequently forgotten, that the great body of English churchmen, both of the clergy and of the laity, were, though not Romanists, yet decidedly Catholics.

subjected ; while the very circumstance of his being easily alarmed, renders his firmness the more praiseworthy, and we shall have occasion to show that in moral courage he was not deficient.

CHAP.  
XII.

Matthew  
Parker.

1559-75.

Although Parker was not an Erastian, he sometimes acted as if he were ; and he set a bad example of appealing to the authority of the crown, when his own authority was defied, as it sometimes was, by the very persons who were sworn to defer to it. It was thus that, in 1564, he brought the royal authority to bear upon certain bishops, who withheld from him their support. Among the bishops several, at first, sympathized with the Puritans rather than with the Anglo-Catholics ; and though they dared not disobey the queen, they had no inclination to share the unpopularity of the primate, who in treading the *via media*, provoked opposition on either side.

That Cecil's report to the queen was drawn up with the concurrence of the archbishop, if not by his advice, there can be no doubt. The queen was irritated, and was quite ready to act, when it was further suggested, that she should strengthen Parker's hands by addressing to him a letter, in which, with reference evidently to the report, she expressed her determination to have "all such diversities, varieties, and *novelties*, as tended to a breach of charity, and were against the laws, good usages, and ordinances of the realm, reformed and repressed, and brought to one manner of uniformity throughout our realm and dominions." She directed the Archbishop of Canterbury (and she promised to issue a similar mandate to the metropolitan of the northern province) to confer with his suffragans ; calling in the aid, if necessary, of the royal commissioners, that measures might be immediately taken to enforce uniformity. No one was to be instituted or collated for the time to come, unless he solemnly

Royal  
mandate to  
the pri-  
mate.

Uniform-  
ity to be  
enforced.



CHAP.  
XII.Matthew  
Parker.  
1559-75.Arch-  
bishop's  
directions  
to the  
Bishop of  
London.

promised that uniformity which the bishops were required to enforce.\*

The archbishop lost no time; and on the 30th of January he wrote to the Bishop of London, to communicate the queen's commands to the bishops of his province. He wrote, at the same time, privately to Cecil, telling him, that it was only from a minority of his suffragans that he could expect a cordial support; and he hoped therefore, that "no back-door influence" would be permitted, such as should induce the queen to change her mind. †

The queen had yielded to the sound advice of her true and faithful friend and counsellor, Sir William Cecil; and she was quite aware of the mischief which would accrue to the state from puritanism, if it were permitted to proceed on its way to anarchy unrestricted and unrestrained. At the same time, she also knew, that the Anglo-Catholics were in the majority, and were strong enough to resist the machinations of their opponents if they could be roused to exertion. It was unpleasant to present herself as a butt to so powerful a party as that of the Puritans, and she was selfish enough to desire that the bishops should incur the responsibility and unpopularity of her measures, while she would only appear on the scene when it should become absolutely necessary to exert the powers of the state.

Parker in  
contro-  
versy with  
the queen.

Parker knew this, and resented it. At the present time the queen was also under the fascination of that bold bad man, Robert Dudley, Earl of Leicester.‡ He

\* Corresp. p. 223-6.

† Ibid. p. 229.

‡ Sir Robert Dudley, K.G., younger son of John Duke of Northumberland, was created Baron Denbigh, September 28, 1563, and Earl of Leicester on September 29, 1569; he must therefore have been at this time in the highest favour with the queen.

obtained over the queen the same kind of fascination, amounting almost to a monomania, as Anne Boleyn had exercised over Elizabeth's father ; and Leicester, though one of the most profligate men of the age, was, nevertheless, a Puritan or patron of Puritans ; and he was not unwilling to exhibit before the court that influence over the queen's mind, which seemed occasionally to nullify the wise counsels of Cecil.

CHAP.  
XII.  
Matthew  
Parker.  
1559-75.  
Leicester's  
influence  
with the  
queen.

Because Cecil upheld the Church, Leicester was the supporter of sectarianism. He was sensible of the power which pertained to a man who represented a powerful party in the realm ; and we are not to be severe upon the Puritan party for having selected such a leader, because a man's real character cannot be fully known while he remains an actor in the scenes of this busy world. We know, indeed, from various sources, that there was a charm in the manner of Leicester, which might well disarm suspicion, until certain facts in his history were brought to light, which, during his lifetime, could seldom amount to more than suspicions.

Leicester  
a leading  
Puritan.

That the Puritans should select as their leader a man, who, at the best, was a dissipated and self-indulgent worldling, might, indeed, surprise us if history, in every age, did not announce the fact, that parties choose their leaders, not on account of their merits, but because of their power, adventitious or personal. To Leicester, the Bishop of Durham, Pilkington, supported by Whittingham, his dean, addressed themselves, and pleaded with ability the cause of those Puritans who, to obtain preferment, had conformed, but struggled to be free from all restraint. They desired to be exonerated from their pledges and their vows, and they represented to the royal favourite, that the queen, by deserting the Church, would increase the number of her loyal and devoted subjects. Whit-

CHAP.  
XII.Matthew  
Parker.

1559-75.

tingham concluded his letter by complaining of the lenity shown to the Anglo-Catholics, whom he styled Papists; and he exclaimed, "Oh, noble earl, be our patron and stay in this behalf, that we may not lose that liberty that hitherto by the queen's benignity we have enjoyed."\*

Leicester nevertheless was quite aware, that although he had the heart of the queen, yet her mind was with Cecil. Cecil felt secure, that, on an emergency, the queen could overcome her passion and bring her powerful intellect and her iron will to uplift the capricious woman into the patriot queen; but he was also aware that, when things went on smoothly, she would frown upon Cecil and Parker, if it were only to win a smile from her fascinating favourite. Parker, in writing to the secretary, complained bitterly of the queen's conduct. He remarked, that it would have been far better to have permitted things to remain as they were, than, after threatening and exasperating their opponents, to retire ignominiously from the battle, if not defeated, yet certainly not confirmed in power. He went so far as, in a letter evidently intended to meet the queen's eye, to utter a threat, saying, that if a remedy were not provided, "I will no more strive against the stream; fume or chide who will."

Parker expressed himself thus strongly, because he saw the queen determined, in her selfishness, to compel him to adopt active measures, and to bear the blame of them, if blame there were, by himself and unsupported.

Like the Puritans, Parker had discovered the value of the press; and, on the side of conformity, he enlisted the pens of Jewel, Gheast, and even of Horn, Bishop of Winchester. As these persons had, at a former period of their lives, expressed their dislike of the retention of sacer-

Parker  
employs  
the press.

\* Neal, i. 126.

dotal garments, and certain other ancient ceremonials of the Church of England, it was supposed, that their change of sentiment would have had a salutary effect upon the Puritans in general. But the truth is, that they regarded the vestment controversy as relating to the non-essentials of religion ; and therefore, they had come to the conclusion that, for the sake of peace, a concession might be made to the prejudices of a large party in the Church.

Bishop Jewel, and others who had sent in their adhesion to the government of Parker in ecclesiastical affairs, had now become sensible that the Church would not gain, if, to gratify the noisy Puritans, the more peaceable Anglo-Catholics should be provoked to resistance. That Jewel and Gheast and some others should have thought, at first, that concession to the Puritans in the vestment controversy would have been the best policy is not wonderful ; but the wonder is, that modern readers should make no allowance for a change of opinion in men of inquiring minds, who lived in an age when all around was in a state of commotion. They realized the principle, that they were called upon, not to establish a Protestant sect, but to reform a branch of the Catholic Church ; and they gradually became aware, that although the popular clamour was raised against the “sacerdotal vestments,” the real attack was made upon the “episcopal regimen.” Throughout this controversy, and long afterwards, a dislike to the Catholic and scriptural ordinance of episcopacy may be traced as the chief motive power in the malcontents.

The line taken by those prelates of the Church of England had an indirect influence upon some of the foreign divines. Gualter and Bullinger were consulted, and not seeing the precise point of the controversy, they advised the English Puritans to conform in what related

CHAP  
XII.

Matthew  
Parker.

1559-75.

Foreign  
theolo-  
gians con-  
sulted.



CHAP.  
XII.Matthew  
Parker.  
1559-75.Puritans  
discover  
Anti-  
Christ in  
the Church  
of Eng-  
land.Prayer  
Book  
popish.Festivals,  
organs,  
chanted  
service,  
figured  
music,  
popish  
abomina-  
tions.Bowling at  
the name  
of our  
Lord.The intro-  
duction of  
wafer-  
bread in  
the Eu-  
charist.Popish  
vestments  
in the Re-  
formed  
Church.

to the clerical attire ; but their interference had no salutary effect upon the leaders of the non-conforming party. In vain also did Parker produce the authority of Bucer and Peter Martyr.

The Puritans now openly complained, that in the ecclesiastical regimen "many traces of Anti-Christ were retained." The Prayer Book, it was said, was filled with many absurdities and silly superfluities. Although the grosser superstitions had been taken away, the whole, it was affirmed, was composed on the model of the papists. The greater part of the canon law was still enforced, and from it ecclesiastical censures were generally taken. Festivals were retained in the name of saints with their vigils as formerly ; the service was chanted with the accompaniment of organs and figured music. All persons were required reverently to bow themselves at the name of Jesus. Chancels were preserved in churches, and generally throughout the Church the prayers were said or sung in the place accustomed in medieval times, unless the bishop should order it otherwise. In the administration of "the Supper," wafer-bread had been reintroduced, after having been done away with in the reign of King Edward : in every church throughout England, the minister was arrayed in a surplice, and in the larger churches the chief minister was obliged to wear a cope. Two other ministers, called the Deacon and Archdeacon, were to assist him in the reading of the Epistle and Gospel. Such was the Church of England in the first days of the Reformation.

In their external dress, the Ministers of the Word, as the Puritans called them, were compelled to conform themselves to that of the Catholic priests, such as the English clergy still claimed to be : the square cap was imposed upon all, together with a gown as long and loose

as conveniently might be; and to some also was added a silk hood. This was the state of the controversy, as we learn from the correspondence of the period, in the year 1566.\*

CHAP.  
XII.

Matthew  
Parker.

1559-75.

Of Parker's controversies with the queen we have already said something, and we shall have occasion to say more. The uncertainty of obtaining the queen's support, even when carrying out her own commands, had the effect of inducing him to employ the aid of the Ecclesiastical Commission, which was framed under a late Act of the parliament. This was a great misfortune, and introduced an Erastian principle into our system not easily eradicated. It may not be easy to vindicate Parker's conduct, but it certainly is not difficult to account for it. Attacked, as Parker was, by one powerful party, and only lukewarmly assisted by the other, it is difficult to say what course he could have pursued different from that which he thought it expedient to adopt. His difficulties in the year 1565 were the greater, because the Puritan party were at this time under the direction of two men equally distinguished for their learning and their piety, and not wholly unamenable to moderate counsels.

Ecclesi-  
astical  
Com-  
mission.

Dr. Sampson had been attracted from the peaceful deanery of Chichester to the deanery of Christ Church, which placed him at the head of society in Oxford. There he found, in the President of Magdalen College, Dr. Humphrys, a man of congenial spirit with his own. When officiating in London, these highly respectable divines refused to comply with the discipline of the Church. They were admonished by the Council; and they addressed to the Ecclesiastical Commissioners, over whom the archbishop presided, a supplicatory letter in

Contro-  
versy with  
Sampson  
and Hum-  
phrys.

\* See Zurich Letters, and Parker's Correspondence.

CHAP.  
XII.Matthew  
Parker.

1559-75.

Latin. They corresponded with Gualter and Bullinger, and were led into a controversy with them and some of their brethren in England, the merits of which it is not necessary here to discuss. It is only necessary to observe, that although the Ecclesiastical Commissioners were divided in their opinions, the decision of the court was, that these divines must either obey the law or submit to the penalties of disobedience. The queen had been roused by a controversy which defied the statutes of the realm, to take an active part in enforcing the law. By a special order from the queen, Sampson was deprived of his deanery; Humphrys, of his own accord, resigned his professorship of divinity and his place as President of Magdalen. In the treatment of these men the character of the archbishop is exhibited to us in pleasant colours. His grace insisted upon an observance of the law; but no sooner had this point been carried, than he showed his compassion by interposing with the queen in behalf of Dr. Sampson, and by obtaining for him, through that intercession, a prebend in St. Paul's Cathedral. A secondary stall in that cathedral provided an income for the incumbent, who was not obliged publicly to officiate in the church. Humphrys was a man of some importance, and having been persuaded by Sir William Cecil to wear the habits, he became the chaplain and biographer of Jewel, and eventually the dean, first of Gloucester, and then of Winchester. At this time, Parker seems to have made a concession to the nonconforming party. So long as the law remained as it was, he determined to enforce it; and he had no wish that the law should be changed; nevertheless he desired, that a dispensing power should be vested in the crown, so that for a certain season, weaker brethren, not under the influence of the malignant passions, might be tolerated and their irregularities remain

Parker's  
tolerant  
spirit.



unnoticed. In his own words, he desired, "That as the queen's pleasure had now been executed for example and for terror to the disobedient, it might be mollified to the commendation of her clemency." But Elizabeth, like other persons of powerful minds, was never in favour of half measures. The queen sternly refused to grant any relaxation of her royal injunctions relating to clerical apparel. She commanded the archbishop to proceed immediately to enforce the law, and compel the London clergy to conform. In consequence of this, the archbishop put in force certain ordinances known in history as the Advertisements.\*

CHAP.  
XII.

Matthew  
Parker.

1559-75.

Adver-  
tisements.

We have seen how carefully Parker, and those who acted with him, endeavoured to deal fairly by both parties or schools in the Church. Concessions were made, first to one side, then to the other; now to the Catholics, now to the Puritans. The clergy were now required, "to set out in their preaching the reverend estimation of the Holy Sacraments of Baptism and the Lord's Supper, exciting the people to the often and devout receiving of the Holy Communion of the Body and Blood of Christ." Every parson, duly licensed, was to preach in his own person once in three months, or by a deputy appointed by the bishop. Frequent communions were enjoined in cathedrals and colleges. The principal minister in the administration of the Holy Communion was to

\* Although the royal sanction was withheld at first from these ordinances, yet it was afterwards accorded to them. But before this was the case, they were regarded as having sufficient authority from the fact of their being issued by the primate of all England, with the implied sanction of his suffragans. They were quoted as authoritative in the Canons of 1571: they have since been recognized as the advertisements of Queen Elizabeth in the Canons of 1640, which were ratified by King Charles I. See Strype, i. 313, ii. 75; Annals, I. ii. 130; Neal's Puritans, i. 127; Burnet, Collier, Hallam, and Lingard.



CHAP.  
XII.Matthew  
Parker.

1559-75.

use a cope, with Gospeller and Epistler agreeably. The dean and prebendaries were to wear the surplice with a silk hood, in the choir; and the silk hood was also to be worn whenever they preached in the cathedral. The clergy were prohibited from superseding the font at Baptism by the introduction of a basin. One of the advertisements has a strange sound to modern ears: "That no child be admitted to answer as godfather or godmother, except the child have received the Holy Communion."

Although the Lord's day was so far kept holy that the shops were to be closed, yet when fairs or common markets fell on a Sunday, there was to be "no showing of any wares before the service were done."

The rogation days were strictly to be kept, and Psalms with the Litany and suffrages to be sung; yet superstitious ceremonies were to be avoided. Strict inquiries were to be made into the character of candidates for holy orders; and at the archdeacon's visitation, he was to appoint certain texts of Scripture to be conned without book, by two curates, and to be by them repeated at the next visitation. The archbishops and bishops were to appear in the apparel usually adopted by their order before the Reformation; the other clergy were to wear for their common apparel, "a side gown with sleeves, and tippets of sarcinet."

Vacillating  
conduct of  
the queen.

The advertisements had been drawn up in 1564; but they waited for the royal sanction. The queen, to please Leicester, would not add her signature; but wishing them to have effect, she told Parker that his authority, as metropolitan, would be sufficient. Parker, as we find from his correspondence, bitterly complained, that as it was known to the public that he was unsupported by the

court, some of his suffragans refused to lend him their assistance, and he was accused of being “the stirrer up and incenser;” nevertheless he was determined to do his duty by the queen and the Church. Before issuing the advertisements, however, he hoped to persuade the dissentious among the London clergy to conform.

By the preaching and example of Sampson and Humphrys, many of the London clergy who had formerly conducted themselves with discretion, had become factious themselves and the cause of faction in others.

In some churches there had been fighting about the habits. The sacred elements in the Blessed Eucharist had, in some places, been sacrilegiously snatched from the communion table, because the bread was wafer-bread, and not that in ordinary use. The clergy, when officiating in other churches, had been mobbed and driven out of the sanctuary because they had appeared in surplices. Following the example of Dean Turner, the mob, when any scandalous person was doing penance, arrayed him in a square cap. The sixteenth century was nearly as sacrilegious and rebellious as the nineteenth. Sometimes the zeal of the Puritan mob descended into puerilities. A complaint had been made to the secretary, that there were, on one occasion, six hundred persons ready to receive the Holy Communion: they came to the church, and found the door shut. The following is the explanation given by his grace the archbishop: “These reporters make *ex muscâ elephantem*. My lord of London can best answer for his own jurisdiction; but this I can say, that where I have sent, divers days, three or four of my chaplains to serve the greatest parishes, for lack of surplices and wafer-bread they did mostly but preach. And one of my chaplains, serving the last Sunday—the 7th of April—the sixth Sunday in Lent,

CHAP.  
XII.

Matthew  
Parker.  
1559–75.

Disturb-  
ances in  
London  
churches.

CHAP.  
XII.Matthew  
Parker.

1559-75.

at a parish, and being informed that divers communicants would have received, the table made all ready accordingly, while he was reading the Passion, one of the men of the parish drew from the table both cup and wafer-bread, because the bread was not common ; and so the minister was derided, and the people disappointed." He concludes his letter thus : "I am not weary to bear to do service to God and to my prince ; but an ox can draw no more than he can." Some of the conforming clergy, not confiding in their own diocesan, Bishop Grindal, applied to the archbishop for advice : he justly complained of being obliged "to attend to another man's charge." One man stated, that it was his practice to turn his face upward, that is, from the people : it was no hindrance, as his church was small, and his voice could be heard. The Litany he said in the body of the church ; and, when he said the service, he kept to the chancel, and turned his face to the east. His only object was to obey the law, and he wished the archbishop to tell him what the law was. There were other trifling charges brought against him, but these are mentioned as throwing light upon the practice of the Church in the year 1564.

Practice  
of the  
Church in  
1564.

We may infer that the charge was brought against this simple-minded conformist, by the Calvinists, who were discontented with the view he took of the doctrine of predestination.\* The archbishop convened a meeting of the Ecclesiastical Commissioners, and invited some of the Privy Council to join the assembly. But the privy councillors, knowing the temper of the court, and unwilling to offend Leicester, declined to intermeddle in what was no immediate concern of theirs. The Commission, therefore, consisted only of bishops. Before them the London clergy made their appearance on March 26.

London  
clergy  
cited  
before the  
Commis-  
sion.

\* Strype, i. 304.

The order of proceeding was remarkable. The chancellor of the diocese presided ; Mr. Thomas Cole, a clergyman, stood by his side in what Neal calls “ priestly apparel,” or, as Strype describes it, “ canonically habited.” The chancellor from the bench addressed the clergy in these words :

“ My masters and the ministers of London,—The Council’s pleasure is, that strictly ye keep the unity of apparel like this man standing here ; that is, a square cap ; a scholar’s gown, priestlike ; a tippet ; and, in the church, a linen surplice ; and that ye inviolably observe the rubric of the Book of Common Prayer. Ye that will subscribe, write *volo* ; those who will not subscribe, write *nolo* ; come, be brief, and make no words.”

Some of the clergy were beginning to speak, when the chancellor called out : “ Peace, peace ; *apparitor*, call the churches, and let each minister answer when his church is named, *subpœna contemptus*, and set your names.” \*

Out of a hundred clergymen present, only thirty-seven refused to sign. The dissentients were suspended for the time, and three months allotted to them to send in their final determination.

The archbishop revoked all licences for preaching, or rather, required new licences to be taken out.

The Anglo-Catholics were in possession of Oxford, which was now regaining its ascendancy. If Cambridge was educating a Whitgift, Oxford and the Anglo-Catholic school were preparing, in Richard Hooker, one of the greatest divines in the Christian Church since the days of St. Bernard. Cambridge was the stronghold of puritanism. The heads of houses frequently encouraged the young undergraduates in profane and indecent excesses. In order to counteract the proceedings of the archbishop

CHAP.  
XII.  
Matthew  
Parker.  
1559-75.

\* Strype’s Grindal, p. 144. Annals, I. ii. 451. Neal, i. 141.



CHAP.  
XII.

Matthew  
Parker.

1559-75.

with respect to preachers, licences were given by the heads of the University to fanatical preachers, whose disaffection was extending from Church affairs to the affairs of state, from the mitre to the crown.

It was a curious circumstance, though by no means unprecedented, that the Puritans were indebted to their greatest enemies for the privilege which they assumed, and it was under the grant of a pope that they prepared to carry on common warfare against Anglicanism and Romanism. By Pope Alexander VI. a privilege was conferred on the University of Cambridge, empowering that academical body to license twelve ministers yearly, who might, under the licence, preach in any part of England, without leave of the bishop of the diocese or the archbishop of the province. These men went forth, sheltering themselves under the authority of a papal bull, and wearing, by the same authority, the academical dress. Before the Reformation, the monastic preachers, or the regulars, claimed the papal permission to preach, not like the parish priests, in their surplice or alb, but in the usual dress of their order. Following the precedent, the academical preachers addressed congregations assembled to hear them, in their usual academical attire.\*

The archbishop, thus defied, appealed for protection to the Chancellor of the University, Sir William Cecil. The Vice-Chancellor pleaded the cause of his University, and the Chancellor could only decide according to law. The practice, however disorderly, could only be set aside by an Act of Parliament.

We are not to suppose that controversy consumed the chief of Parker's time and mind. In general history, a

\* The reader interested on this subject may do well to consult Archdeacon Harrison's "Historical Inquiry into the Interpretation of the Rubrics."

large space is occupied by the account given of wars and battles ; the peaceful progress of the country is only recorded in its happy results. We shall find Parker happily engaged in a variety of literary pursuits ; and, in point of fact, the great controversy in which he was involved—that which is sometimes called “ The Vestiarian Controversy ”—reached its climax in 1566. Although it broke out again with great bitterness towards the close of Parker’s life, yet he had the satisfaction of enjoying much success and consequent repose. The bishops gradually began to understand, that the real controversy of the day was waged against episcopacy itself ; and some of those very prelates who had been, at one time, most opposed to his policy, were found justly to appreciate his political wisdom. The hostility of Leicester was sometimes injurious to the cause and perplexing to the archbishop ; but, as we shall hereafter see, the queen, after having given to Parker sometimes just cause of offence, would afterwards seek to pacify him by little acts of courtesy and kindness. Although he had often to deplore the weakness of the woman, he always did full justice to the greatness of the queen. Leicester pandered to her faults ; Cecil and Parker dared her anger in their desire to promote her welfare, in furthering that of her realm and Church.

Peter Heylin lived near enough to the time to render his testimony valuable to the success of Parker’s labours ; and even if he took a favourable view of the case, he will be found, on examination, to be substantially correct. His words are : “ Now we may behold the face of the Church of England as it was first settled and established under Queen Elizabeth.

“ The government of the Church by archbishops and bishops, according to the practice of the best and happiest

CHAP.  
XII.

Matthew  
Parker.

1559-75.

English  
Reforma-  
tion de-  
scribed.

CHAP.  
XII.Matthew  
Parker.

1559-75.

times of Christianity. These bishops nominated and elected according to the statute in the 25th of King Henry VIII., and consecrated by the ordinal confirmed by parliament in the fifth and sixth years of King Edward VI.; never appearing publicly but in their rochets, nor officiating otherwise than in copes at the holy altar. The priests not stirring out of doors but in their square caps, gowns, or canonical coats, nor executing any divine office but in their surplice--a vestment set apart for religious services in the primitive times, as may be gathered from St. Chrysostome,\* for the Eastern Churches, and from St. Hierom† for the Western.

“The doctrine of the Church reduced unto its ancient purity, according to the articles agreed upon in Convocation, anno 1552.

“The Liturgy conform to the primitive patterns, and all the rites and ceremonies therein prescribed, accommodated to the honour of God and the increase of piety.

“The festivals preserved in their former dignity, observed with their distinct offices peculiar to them, and celebrated with a religious concourse of all sorts of people: the weekly fasts, the holy times of Lent, the embering weeks, together with the fast of the Rogation, severely kept by forbearance of all kind of flesh; not now as by virtue of the statute, as in the reign of King Edward, but

\* Chrys. in Matt. Hom. 82, ii. 471, ed. Field: ἵνα λευκὸν χιτωνίσχον καὶ ἀποστρίβοντα περιβαλλόμενοι περιῖητε.

† Hieron. adv. Pelagianos, lib. ii. (Opera, ed. Martianay, Paris, 1706, tom. ii. pars ii. col. 502): “Quæ sunt rogo inimicitiae contra Deum. . . si episcopus, presbyter, et diaconus, et reliquus ordo ecclesiasticus, in administratione sacrificiorum candida veste processerint?” This and the preceding passage have been found by the help of Cypr. Anglic., p. 6, where, however, the references are given with Heylin’s usual incorrectness. Comp. Hooker, book v. cap. 29.

as appointed by the Church in her public calendar before the Book of Common Prayer. The Sacrament of the Lord's Supper celebrated in most reverent manner, the holy table seated in the place of the altar, the people making their due reverence at their first entrance into the Church,\* kneeling at the Communion, the Confession, and the public prayers, standing up at the Creed, the Gospels, and the Gloria Patri, and using the accustomed reverence at the name of Jesus.

CHAP.  
XII.  
Matthew  
Parker.  
1559-75.

“Music retained in all such churches in which provision had been made for the maintenance of it, or where the people could be trained up at the least to plain song. All which particulars were either established by the laws, or commanded by the queen's injunctions, or otherwise retained by virtue of some ancient usages not by law prohibited.

“Nor is it much to be admired that such a general conformity to those ancient usages was constantly observed in all cathedrals and the most part of parish churches, considering how well they were preceded by the Court itself, in which the Liturgy was officiated every day, both morning and evening, not only in the public chapel, but the private closet; celebrated in the chapel with organs and other musical instruments, and the most excellent voices, both of men and children, that could be got in all the kingdom. The gentlemen and children in their surplices, and the priests in copes as oft they attended divine service at the holy altar. The altar furnished with rich plate, two fair candlesticks with tapers in them, and a massy crucifix of silver in the midst thereof.”†

\* See Cypr. Anglic., p. 17, where the subject of this section is more fully treated.

† Heylin's History of the Reformation, p. 314, edit. Robertson. The



CHAP.  
XII.

Matthew  
Parker.

1559-75.

Wolfgang  
Musculus.

But his view of the case is corroborated by that taken by one strictly contemporary with Parker, whose testimony is the more valuable from the circumstance of his being a foreigner.

Wolfgang Musculus, in the Preface to his "Common Places," by Man, remarks: "How gravely, learnedly, and christianly his grace and others the bishops, by their most godly travail, with the good help of the queen's laws in that behalf provided, had reformed the state of the corrupt Church, restored to God his due honour in public service, planted true obedience to her majesty in the hearts and consciences of her subjects, delivered the thrall'd minds of true Christians from their heavy bondage and oppression, drawn deceived souls out of most dangerous error, and to the people's eternal comfort published the most glorious light of God's most holy truth." \*

Let it be remembered, that this reformation was effected in a Church of which two thirds of the members were known to be Anglo-Catholics—by men who, having renounced all allegiance to the pope and the papal court, were aware that this very circumstance rendered certain reforms necessary; who were willing to reform, but who were steadily opposed to Puritanism. Nothing, indeed, could prove more completely the loyalty of the Anglo-Catholic body, than their refusal to take part in the insurrection in the north of England, which, under the Earls of Northumberland and Westmoreland, had for its object the overthrow of the entire work of the Reformation and the reduction of ecclesiastical affairs to the state in which they existed in Queen Mary's reign. The insurgents were notes of Canon Robertson add considerably to the value of the edition published by the Ecclesiastical History Society.

\* The work translated by John Man, Warden of Merton College, Oxford

roused to action by popish incendiaries, by a papistical faction organized in Roman seminaries, clandestinely patronized by foreign princes adhering to the Roman obedience, and inspired by the fanaticism of unprincipled zealots.

It is sometimes carelessly said, that many of the Romanists enlisted in the army of the Duke of Suffolk, by which the earls just mentioned were defeated. But the Romanists were the very persons who instigated the rebellion; and therefore what is really meant is, that amongst the foremost to display their loyalty, when the standard of rebellion was raised, was the great body of English churchmen—Catholics, but not papists.

Nothing could have happened more injurious to the interests of true religion and virtue, than the impolitic act on the part of Rome in constituting that schism which dissenting papists are to this very day carrying on. The Romish schism in England—Anglo-Romanism as opposed to Anglo-Catholicism—dates from the year 1570.

The authorities of Rome were exasperated by finding that the English Catholics were becoming year by year more satisfied with the state of ecclesiastical affairs in their native country; and that, having renounced all allegiance to the papal throne, they were not prepared to accept the decrees of the Tridentine Council.

A bull, excommunicating Queen Elizabeth, was signed on the 22nd April, 1570, by Pope Pius V. It was found posted on the gates of London House, denouncing vengeance on Elizabeth, and commanding her subjects, under pain of sharing her excommunication, to violate their oaths of allegiance to the crown.\*

\* It was printed in Wilkins, iv. 260, 261, and in Camden's Annales, p. 183. It is differently dated in the two works; but Hardwick gives the date in the text as that on which the bull was really issued.

CHAP.  
XII.

Matthew  
Parker.  
1559-75.

Anglo-Ro-  
manism.

The queen  
excom-  
municated.  
April 22,  
1570.

CHAP.  
XII.

Matthew  
Parker.

1559-75.

She was treated in this instrument as merely the pretended queen of England ; she is styled a usurper, and a vassal of all iniquity. The government was justly indignant ; but the queen issued a complimentary address to the Anglo-Catholics, most timely and well advised.\* It showed to Englishmen how her reforming government could distinguish between Anglo-Catholics and papists : it proclaimed to all Europe, that the disturbances in her realm were occasioned, not by her own subjects, but by the intrigues of the foreigner, and by the malcontents at Rome and in the Romish seminaries.

The Puritans, when the government was thus menaced by the court of Rome, instead of rallying round their queen, added to the perplexities of the government by renewing their assault on the English Church and Reformation. They had, since the year 1566, been without a leader, and, consequently, the cause of nonconformity waxed feeble ; but at the same time that the Romanists established their schism in England, the Puritans became a dissenting body external to the Church. In Thomas Cartwright, Margaret Professor of Divinity in the University of Cambridge, they found the man whom their circumstances required.

Thomas  
Cart-  
wright.

Of Thomas Cartwright, and the controversies more immediately connected with his name, we shall have to speak in the life of Whitgift ; we need only at present remark, that his hostility to the Church may, in the first instance, be traced to disappointed ambition. Having quitted the University, he travelled to Geneva, and here he was distinguished, as among other things, so especially for his dislike of episcopacy. By his great learning, by his many virtues, by the charm of his manners, and by his

\* It is given in Sanders' book "De Schismate Anglicano," and is translated by Collier.

devout demeanour, he made many friends, and became intimate with Theodore Beza. Through the successor of John Calvin, he obtained an insight into the Genevan discipline; and Beza's diatribes against the English hierarchy were as music to the ear, and as ambrosia to the soul, of the English schismatic.

About the year 1570, Cartwright returned to England. His friends were powerful, and his opponents he no longer dreaded. But those opponents soon discovered, that he was still an object of alarm, for he was reinstated as the head of his party. The authorities at Cambridge were easily persuaded to replace him in his professorship; and his high position gave weight to his declamations against episcopacy and the Church. He endeavoured to narrow the controversy, and to make the question turn, not upon doctrine so much as upon a mere question of discipline. He called upon the Church to surrender everything except what he called doctrine; and the very important doctrine of the apostolical succession he ignored. He attacked the Ordinal, because he denied that episcopacy had, as the Catholic Church asserts, an exclusive right of ordination, being the means of continuing the Church, as distinguished from sects. He maintained the parity of bishops and presbyters, and contended, that no minister of Christ should undertake duties not purely spiritual. He pronounced a bishop to be incapable of a title, of a seat in parliament, or of civil authority of any kind beyond that of a preacher. He denounced the respective offices of deans, archdeacons, and other cathedral functionaries, and held their precedence to be an infringement upon the privileges of ordinary presbyters. Though he permitted the use of the Geneva Prayer Book, he claimed for the clergy a free licence of extemporaneous prayer. Saints' days, the Lenten and other fasts observed

CHAP.  
XII.

Matthew  
Parker.

1559-75.

Renun-  
ciation of  
all Church  
principles.



CHAP.  
XII.Matthew  
Parker.

1559-75.

from time immemorial in the Catholic Church, were denounced as unscriptural and superstitious. In baptism, he was offended by the sign of the cross, by the occasional administration of the sacrament by midwives or other women, and by the use of sponsors. The churching of women was Judaic; confirmation looked too much like a sacrament; kneeling at the Lord's Supper led to idolatrous abuse. He objected to our bowing at the name of the Saviour; and to the ring in marriage, because he thought it gave a sacramental character to that rite, which is expressly called a sacrament in our homilies. The surplice and the ceremonies of the ancient Church, still retained, were branded as disgraceful. Many Protestants regarded them as holy, but he denounced their continuance, because, through them, an affinity was claimed with that Catholic Church which he had forsaken, but which our reformers had professed only to reform.

These sentiments, under various modifications of expression, were freely circulated. They were refuted by the English reformers; but we use arguments in vain when the passions are roused; and to Cartwright we may trace the first organization of Protestant dissent in England.

Romish  
dissent.

Of the first seeds of Romish dissent we have already spoken. For many years afterwards, the schismatic Romanists in this country were governed by the authorities at Rome, at first without the intervention of bishops, through presbyters specially appointed and invested with extraordinary powers not pertaining to their office; and afterwards by bishops in partibus. It was not till the time of Cardinal Wiseman, that Roman bishops were consecrated with English titles, and, as it appears from a late controversy, they are not, even now, permitted to discharge the episcopal functions with that freedom of

action to which a Catholic bishop justly claims a right ; they are not ordinaries, but they are mere functionaries of Rome.

CHAP.  
XII.

Matthew  
Parker.

1559-75.

Returning to the Puritans ; it was not till May, 1573, that they actually succeeded in the formation of a separate association. At Wandsworth, a village at an easy distance from London, the first presbytery was established. It consisted not merely of nonconforming ministers, but it was also joined by several laymen.

Eleven elders were chosen, and their offices were described in a register, and entitled the Orders of Wandsworth. Under a wholesome dread of the Court of High Commission, they took every precaution to keep their proceedings secret ; and, perhaps from a disinclination to cause unnecessary disturbance, while they abstained from a public defiance of the queen's government, no search was made for them. They remained, as a body, undisturbed, until the occurrence of certain events hereafter to be described.

Character  
of the  
Puritan  
schism.

This organization of Puritanism, as a distinct body, after the suppression of Puritans within the Church, caused no little anxiety and trouble in the last years of Parker's life. The Puritans, with Leicester and some other of the royal favourites to support them, had always many friends at the council board, and the enemies of the archbishop were numerous and powerful in the parliament of 1571.

Several years of peace and prosperity had passed since the last meeting of parliament ; and parliamentary life had not yet become the channel through which ambitious men could rise to honour or realize wealth. The people seldom cared for the meeting of parliament, unless they were roused to tumult by disappointed demagogues or importunate party leaders.

But the late insurrection in the north of England, and

CHAP.  
XII.Matthew  
Parker.

1559-75.

Parlia-  
ment,  
April 2,  
1571.

the expenses incurred in its suppression, rendered it expedient, if not absolutely necessary, that a parliament and a Convocation should be convened. On the 2nd of April, 1571, the queen opened her parliament in great state. She first proceeded to Westminster Abbey, where a sermon was preached by the Bishop of Lincoln. On repairing afterwards to the House of Lords, she directed the House of Commons to be summoned to the bar as usual, when, addressing the two Houses, the queen spoke to the following effect :—

“My right loving lords, and you our right faithful and obedient subjects. We, in the name of God, for his service, and for the safety of this state, are now here assembled to his glory, I hope, and pray it may be to your comfort and the common quiet of our, yours, and all ours for ever.” She then looked towards Sir Nicholas Bacon, still Lord Keeper of the Great Seal of England, who, standing at the queen’s right hand, a little before the cloth of estate, and somewhat back and lower than the same, she expressed her desire that he should read, what in these days we should call the queen’s speech.\*

A very bitter feeling was exhibited by the Puritans in this parliament. That they were, however, in a minority, is proved by the fact, that though they talked much, they could do nothing. The majority were for the most part silent, being fully persuaded of the protection and firmness of the queen.

\* The ceremonies and speeches of this parliament are omitted in the journals, but are supplied by private memorandums of Sir Symonds D’Ewes. In the House of Commons it was agreed that the Litany should be read every day, as in the last parliament, and also that a prayer should be said by Mr. Speaker, the House always commencing business at half past 8 o’clock. Every absentee was required to put fourpence in the poor man’s box.—Perry, p. 287.

Although the Prayer Book was attacked and represented as retaining many superstitions, yet it is clearly to be seen that the whole object was to abolish episcopacy, and for this purpose to assail and insult the bishops. In the administration of ecclesiastical affairs there was much that required reform. The power formerly exercised by the popes, with respect to the externals of the Church, had now been transferred to the archiepiscopal court; and, as we shall presently see, to the administration of the law in the same. Difficulties arose which it was more easy to perceive than to overcome. To the attack of the bishops the Puritans now added a complaint against the primate, for not exercising that discipline in the Church, which, when he attempted to exercise it, they were the first to denounce as tyranny, and to attribute to priestly ambition.

CHAP.  
XII.

Matthew  
Parker.  
1559-75.

Further  
reforms  
required.

That the object was to supersede the Church by a sect, is clear from a proposal made to adopt a Protestant confession of faith. Such the Thirty-nine Articles have been regarded by Puritans in a later age; but such, in reality, they were not, and to them the Puritans were in Parker's time opposed. As a specimen of the insults to which the primate was exposed, the following circumstances will be narrated: A gentleman of the name of Strickland had taken an active part against the Church in parliament, but was less personal in his attack upon the bishops than some of his associates had been. He proposed that a committee should be appointed to hold conference with the lords of the spirituality, for the consideration of reformation in the matters complained of.

Violence of  
Strickland.

The archbishop received the committee with his usual courtesy, and accepted from their hands their model for reformation. On looking over the draught, he noticed the proposal, that the office for the consecration of



CHAP.  
XII.Matthew  
Parker.

1559-75.

bishops should be omitted ; when Mr. Peter Wentworth, a hot-tempered intemperate man, replied, that the bishops were so occupied with other matters, that they could not attend to the Word of God, or ascertain how the doctrines of the Church agreed therewith. The archbishop mildly replied, that he thought there must be some mistake, and that they should defer on these subjects to the bishops.

Peter  
Went-  
worth.

"No—by the faith I bear to God," exclaimed Wentworth, fiercely and rudely, "we will pass nothing before we understand what it is. For that were to make you popes. Make you popes who list ; we will make you none." Wentworth in the next parliament took it upon himself to speak as disparagingly of the queen, and was sequestered from the House and committed to the serjeant as prisoner for some time.\*

Puritan  
admoni-  
tions.

The Puritans within the House were supported by the Puritans in general, who presented two admonitions to the parliament ; the first drawn up by Field and Wilcox, the second by Thomas Cartwright. The tone of both admonitions was the same, petitioning the House of Commons for the overthrow of that Catholic discipline which the Church had retained ; and calling for another discipline more accordant, in their opinion, with the Word of God and the religious communities on the Continent.

By the firmness of the queen and the archbishop, the mischief designed by these persons was, for a season, averted, and the hands of the former were moreover strengthened by the divisions which soon broke out among the Puritans themselves. The Puritans who had

\* In one of his sermons before the queen, Deering, a popular preacher, ventured to say of her, that when she was under persecution her motto was "*tanquam ovis*," but now it might be "*tanquam indomita juvenca*." Neal, i. cap. v. Notwithstanding Elizabeth's despotism, men indulged in much freedom of speech.

conformed, seeing now that the overthrow of episcopacy was the object of the Nonconformists, gradually became more loyal to the Church at the very time when the Anglo-Catholics, alarmed by the extreme measures adopted at Rome, were becoming more Protestant. To another class of Puritans the archbishop himself gave the name of "Precisians;" their peculiar tenets are suggested by their title. Another branch of the Puritans were the Brownists, who derived their name from Robert Brown. This schismatic inveighed against the hierarchy as anti-Christian and not better than the mission of the priests of Baal. He was the founder of the Independents or Congregationalists, but he ended his life as a Conformist.

CHAP.  
XII.

Matthew  
Parker.

1559-75

Precisians.

Brown, the  
founder of  
the Inde-  
pendents.

Prophe-  
sings.

The last important controversy which disturbed the peace of Archbishop Parker, had reference to what was called the prophesyings. This term was applied to certain clerical meetings which, considered in themselves and abstractedly, were harmless enough. At a fixed time and place, a public meeting being convened, certain of the clergy were called upon to expound a text of Scripture. A moderator presided to keep order, and a debate ensued. Whatever may be thought of the proceeding itself, it was, however, ill adapted for the time. Controversial subjects were continually discussed; questions were mooted on the discipline of the Church; and the lawfulness of episcopacy was called in question.

The queen having been informed, that prophesyings prevailed in the diocese of Norwich, directed the archbishop to suppress the meetings. At first, the Bishop of Norwich, Dr. Parkhurst, resisted the archbishop's interference. The bishop appealed to the Earl of Leicester, and obtained the support of a minority in the Privy Council. The archbishop, however, determined to persevere; and although, to humour Leicester, the queen

CHAP.  
XII.Matthew  
Parker.

1559-75.

Supported  
by the  
Earl of  
Sussex.

did not give him all the support he had a right to expect, he declared his resolution to obey her majesty's commands, even though apparently in opposition to her majesty's wishes. If Parker had a bitter enemy through life in Leicester, he found in Leicester's opponent, the Earl of Sussex, now lord chamberlain, a kind supporter and friend. Through the lord chamberlain, he expostulated with the queen upon her vacillating conduct; and although she, at first, was inclined to take offence, her treatment of the primate was so manifestly unjust, that, notwithstanding she was still under the influence of Leicester, she found opportunity to pacify his grace by some little acts of personal kindness.

In a letter to the lord chamberlain he writes thus: "I have received your honourable letters answering my request to know her majesty's pleasure. I have great cause to acknowledge my bounden duty of thanks and readiness of service to her highness, for her majesty's special favour so to consider of me her poor chaplain, . . . and if I can do your lordship any pleasure or service, I pray you to be bold of me as your assured well-willer. And thus Almighty God preserve your honour to his pleasure."

Throughout his life the primate had ground of complaint against some of his suffragans. While Leicester and the Puritans were insulting him in various ways, imprisoning his servants and injuring his reputation, several of the bishops, being intimidated, now "slunk away from him." Writing to his old friend William Cecil, now become Lord Burghley,\* Parker refers to the

\* William Cecil was created Baron of Burghley in the county of Northampton, February 25, 1571. In the patent of the creation of this title it is written Burghley throughout, excepting in the clause which provides that the grantee and his heirs male shall have a seat in parliament, when it is spelt Burleigh.

treatment he received—treatment that so seriously interfered with the discharge of his duties, that he should be driven to despair if he had not his books and literary labours to fall back upon. On one occasion he said, “I toy out my time partly with copying of books; partly in devising ordinances for scholars to help the ministry; partly in genealogies,” etc. This was said in one of those gloomy moments which every active man, amidst the worries of life, is sure to experience.

CHAP.  
XII.

Matthew  
Parker.

1559–75.

At the risk of encroaching upon a subject reserved for the next chapter, we must here allude to a visitation, held by Parker, of the Isle of Wight, because out of this visitation arose a controversy with the queen. That he had a right to visit any diocese in his province will be presently seen; but he seems to have undertaken the visitation of the Isle of Wight at the request of the Bishop of Winchester himself; or, at all events, with his concurrence. That the circumstances must have been urgent that induced him, when in an infirm state of health, towards the close of life, to undertake the duty, no one will deny. The island was not easily approached in those days, and the passage, though very short, was long enough, under a strong and contrary wind, to subject to considerable inconvenience an aged man not accustomed to the water; especially when certain difficulties were to be encountered in effecting a landing, which were not entirely surmounted within the memory of man, or fifty years ago.

Visitation  
of the Isle  
of Wight.

He found everything in confusion when he landed on the island: the Puritans had introduced their novelties; the clergy were too careless to resist them; and every rule of the Church was set at naught or violated. The clergy, however, when a leader, on the orthodox side, appeared among them, rallied round the primate, and



CHAP.  
XII.Matthew  
Parker.

1559-75.

aided by them, he soon reformed the Church, and remedied the evils which the diocesan had been unable to surmount. He obtained the applause of churchmen, and the thanks of the Bishop of Winchester. The whole of this transaction confirms a conjecture, which we have already hazarded, that Bishop Horn, like Bishop Jewel, had towards the close of his life been won by the archbishop to the side of Anglicanism.

There were, nevertheless, many discontented persons, and these malcontents courted the favour of the Earl of Leicester, by bringing before him an accusation of the archbishop, whose discipline they represented as rigorous, tyrannical, and unjust. Leicester rejoiced in an opportunity of decrying the primate in the eyes of the queen; and he represented to her how, in the misconduct of the primate, her own character might be impaired in the minds of the people, whose esteem she was always ambitious to retain. The queen was at Hampton Court. It was one of those times in which her infatuation with respect to Leicester created scandal among her enemies, and caused her friends much distress of mind.

To mark his reprobation of the queen's conduct, and of the condition, at that time, of her court, the primate in a marked way, though pleading probably his advanced age and his many infirmities as an excuse, had absented himself from the courtly circle.

Leicester felt the rebuke, though tacitly made; and he caused the queen to share his feelings. The absence of the archbishop from the court was represented as an insult to his sovereign, and a want of loyalty. If his age and infirmities were pleaded, Leicester could now point to his exertions in the Isle of Wight; if he could conduct a visitation there, he might assuredly encounter the fatigue of paying his respects at Hampton Court. But it

was now stated to the queen, that he was not only neglecting his duty to the queen's grace, but, by the misuse of her name, that he was involving her in his own unpopularity. His attendance at court was commanded, and he obeyed. The venerable old man, expecting a speedy summons into the presence of his Divine Master in heaven, appeared before the queen over whose cradle he had watched, and whom, through a long life, he had faithfully served; he appeared, when it was known that the physicians had declared him to be labouring under a mortal disease, to have his feelings wounded by the coldness of his sovereign.

It was with Elizabeth, according to the old saying, "*aut amat aut odit mulier, nihil est tertium*;" while among her acquaintance some were raised into angels, and others depressed into enemies of mankind, ordinary mortals found no place in her regard. She was accustomed to be either so gracious in her manner as to be accused of fawning upon her favourites, or she was outrageously coarse in her rudeness.

The archbishop was deeply aggrieved by the queen's conduct, and at the gratuitous insults from others which that conduct suggested or encouraged. When he returned home, discontented with everything and everybody, he addressed an angry letter to a friend not mentioned, but probably the Earl of Sussex, exhorting him to be true to his principles, however much he might be subjected to insults from unworthy courtiers. He fell foul of everything and of everybody. He reproached, among others, even Lord Burghley, who unfortunately was too open to the charge, for appropriating Church property when there was some "*angulus*" necessary to render his grounds complete: the queen herself was boldly and justly censured for permitting the alienation

CHAP.  
XII.

Matthew  
Parker.

1559-75.

CHAP.  
XII.Matthew  
Parker.

1559-75.

of the Church estates, in order that she might purchase loyalty of expression among persons whose true love reached not beyond themselves.

The archbishop wrote the letter. He was advised to burn it. He followed this advice. The wisdom of the proceeding was apparent, for he was soon restored to the queen's favour, and in the sunshine of her smile, he forgot her insults. He probably purchased the good graces of Leicester ; for we find a legacy to Leicester left, in his will, by Parker. We may indeed observe, that throughout his career placability was one of Parker's merits.

As respects Parker's character as a controversialist, and after a due consideration of the manner in which controversies were at that time generally conducted, we must give him credit for a moderation which we look for in vain elsewhere. In proof of the justice of this remark, the reader may institute a comparison between Parker and Reginald Pole, of whose excessive abuse of Henry VIII. and his other opponents instances have been given by quotations from his works in the preceding volume. But we must, on the other hand, observe, that while the object of Pole was to excite an alarm, it was obviously politic, on Parker's part, to conciliate. Parker had to consider, on the one side, the Anglo-Catholics, and on the other, the Puritans. Each party demanded concessions, and when the demand was made upon Parker, it was made upon one who had, very frequently, no precedent to follow, and no counsellor from whom to seek advice. He had to rely on his own judgment ; and to do this, moreover, under novel circumstances ; and very often from a standpoint which had never been occupied by his predecessors. We may, therefore, express regret, but we can hardly feel surprise, when we find him, not unfrequently, having regard to the expe-

dient rather than to the true ; and when what he asserted at a later period of life was, occasionally, inconsistent with that for which he had, in previous years, contended. At one time he was alarmed by the Anglo-Catholics, lest they should yield to the solicitation of the foreigner, and, having become papists, raise the standard of revolt ; at another time, he found Puritans converted into what he called Precisians, declaring against the queen, and coming forth as rebels, though from a different camp.

Towards the close of his life, though he was still opposed to the Puritans, Parker seems to have felt more alarm at the papists. He lacked the sagacity of a statesman to foresee coming events, and to take precautions against possible occurrences. He was no philosopher to devise a scheme of policy or of doctrine, and to mark out a course of action. He was determined in will and wise in council when a sudden emergency perplexed the queen and her counsellors ; but as his object generally was, not to establish a theory, but to overcome a present difficulty, it would be easy to convict him of inconsistencies ;—to represent him, at one time, as an Anglo-Catholic, which he really was ; and at another, as a Puritan, though here he thought to guard against a charge of inconsistency by denominating his opponents as Precisians. He was as a man whose house is on fire, when he feels that his business is to save what he can. That the Church of England did not come unscathed from the fiery trial to which it was subjected in the sixteenth century cannot be denied ; and we must feel deep gratitude to those whose wisdom and firmness preserved for us all that is essential. The splendid furniture was much of it lost ; but the old walls and the solid foundation still remained. The pope was deposed, but the bishop retained his throne.

CHAP.  
XII.

Matthew  
Parker.  
1559-75.



CHAP.  
XII.Matthew  
Parker.

1559-75.

Parker and the queen clearly understood the difference between an Anglo-Catholic and a Roman Catholic ; but Parker was alarmed, in his latter days, at the manner in which the queen, in her desire to thwart the designs of the Puritans, had overlooked the intermingling of the papists from abroad with the Anglo-Catholic body at home, to the manifest detriment of the Anglicans, and at her own personal risk.

He remonstrated with the queen, and urged upon Burghley the necessity of adopting precautionary measures. In a letter addressed to the minister, he makes certain statements which perhaps it would have been better to omit, but the letter cannot be passed over in silence in such a chapter as the present :—

“Her majesty told me that I had supreme government ecclesiastical ; but what is it to govern cumbered with such subtlety ? Before God I fear that her highness’s authority is not regarded, so that if they could, for fear of further inconvenience, they would change her government ; yea, yours and mine, however cunningly soever we deal it. And surely, my Lord, whatever cometh of it, in this my letter I admonish you to look into it with such sincerity as God may be pleased, or else He will rise one day and revenge his enemies. Does your lordship think that I care for cap, tippet, surplice, wafer-bread, or any such ? But for the laws so established I esteem them, and not more for contempt against law and authority, which I see will be the end of it, nor for any other respect. If I, you, or any other named ‘Great Papists,’ should so favour the pope or religion, that we should not preach Christ’s true Gospel, woe be to us all !”

This principle is still prevalent among those who represent Parker’s opinions. We ask what is the law ; and, though we may look for an alteration of the law, at

a proper time and place, what is now declared by lawyers to be the law, that we obey.

It is due to Parker to state, that he discerned the controversial abilities of Whitgift, and suggested him as the proper antagonist of Cartwright. But into the controversies with Cartwright on the one side, and with Campion on the other, it is unnecessary to enter in this place; they will come before the reader more correctly in a future volume.

CHAP.  
XII.

Matthew  
Parker.  
1559-75.

## CHAPTER XIII.

## VISITATIONS.

Parker's care not to increase the expenses of the inferior clergy.—Determined to hold a metropolitical visitation.—Opposed by his Suffragans.—The returned Exiles preferred.—Their avarice.—Visitation of Canterbury by Commission.—Anglo-Catholics and Puritans.—Inquiry into the state of churches.—Irregularity of the inquiries.—Irregularities brought to light.—Incestuous marriages.—Diocesan visitations.—Parker declined procurations.—Parker appeared in great state, but paid all expenses from his private purse.—His residence at Bekesbourne.—Scarcity of food.—Fast appointed by the archbishop.—Form of prayer drawn up by Grindal.—Corrected by Parker.—Visitation of Hospitals and Schools.—Visitation of Sandwich.—The archiepiscopal peculiars.—State of Canterbury Cathedral.—Regulations for preachers.—Complaints of irregularity in the local dioceses.—Articles of inquiry in the diocese of Norwich.—Visitation of the Metropolitan Cathedral.—Efficacy of Prayer.—Quarrel with Lord Keeper Bacon.—Visits his own diocese in person.—Confirmations and consecrations.—Dispute between the Dean and one of the Canons.—Statutes given to Cathedrals of the new foundation.—Concealers.—Hospitals visited.—Appointment of a Suffragan Bishop of Dover.—Visits the Universities.—Royal Commission.—Disturbances at Cambridge.—Condition of Bene't College.—Winchester, Eton, and Westminster visited.—Alarm at the report of the Parisian Massacre on St. Bartholomew's Day.—Seminarists in England.

CHAP.  
XIII.Matthew  
Parker.

1559-75.

THE reader of these volumes will remember the great power exercised by the primate over his suffragans, especially at the metropolitical visitations.\* The Arch-

\* See Bishop Stillingfleet, Duties and Rights of the Parochial Clergy. Bishop Gibson on Visitations. Barbosa de officio et potestate Episcopi. De Episcopis eorum auctoritate, officio et potestate Joannis Bertachini a Firmo.

bishops of Canterbury could cite any of these persons before them, wheresoever they were in the city, diocese, or province of Canterbury, not only by way of appeal or complaint, but also *ex officio*. They could depose dignitaries and other functionaries, and appoint their successors. As bishops, at their visitations, inhibited deans, archdeacons, and all subordinate ordinaries, so was the episcopal office, so far as it pertained to the suffragans, suspended during a metropolitical visitation. For moral offences the archbishop could compel the highest of the consistory to do public penance, and could inflict the same penalty for any trivial offences; as when it is stated in "Courtney's Register," that the tenants of Wingham did penance, "for that they did ridiculously and contemptuously their service, which was to carry straw to the archbishop's table." \* The reader cannot forget the complaints which were urged, especially by the poorer clergy, of the expenses to which they were exposed, by the archiepiscopal and episcopal visitations. During the last few years antecedently the consecration of Parker, these complaints had been renewed and increased; for the bishops, aware of the insecurity of their property, visited more frequently than before, and added to their unpopularity by permitting it to be seen, that the object was not to benefit the Church, but to fill their coffers.

In a letter addressed to the Bishop of London, Archbishop Parker expressed himself in feeling terms on the extreme poverty of the inferior clergy. They were unblushingly robbed by the powerful among their neighbours; while, at the same time, to save the payment of fees, the poorer brethren too would abstain from an observance of the ordinances of religion.

CHAP.  
XIII.

Matthew  
Parker.

1559-75.

Expen-  
siveness of  
visitations.

\* Strype's Collectanea, iii. 181.



CHAP.  
XIII.Matthew  
Parker.

1559-75.

The archbishop resolved, that the clergy should not be still further impoverished; although he was painfully aware, that it was absolutely necessary to hold a metropolitical visitation; as well as a visitation of his own diocese. The demand for a reformation of the Church was still urgent, and it could not be fully met, until the primate had ascertained what might be its present requirements, and what were the dangers to which it was exposed.

Archbishop Parker was determined to save the clergy from those expenses to which they had been exposed when bishops, travelling with a large retinue, were entertained at the charge of the parishes they visited, by holding his metropolitical visitation by commission. He appointed certain commissioners, few in number, to make the inquiries he wanted, and to report to him upon the condition of every diocese they entered.

Opposed  
by many  
of his suf-  
fragans.

Every such economical proceeding, while benefiting the powerless multitude, is sure to excite the indignation of certain persons in authority who calculate only with reference to their perquisites and private advantage. When the archbishop gave notice that he should visit by commission, he expected his example to be followed by his suffragans: but he found that, in some instances, the diocesans were determined, as soon as the metropolitical visitation was concluded, to hold a visitation for themselves. After the inquiries and reports of the commissioners appointed by his grace, this proceeding, so far as the general purposes of the Church were concerned, would be utterly useless. The bishops who determined on a visitation to be held under such circumstances, could only have been influenced by avaricious motives; and the archbishop determined not to be thwarted, but to constitute himself the protector of the poorer clergy.

He had a right to inhibit the diocesans during a metropolitical visitation, and this inhibition he issued. Some of his suffragans were inclined to set his authority at naught ; but he was firm, and they were in a minority, and he therefore carried his point. The metropolitical visitation covered a space of three years, and by that time he hoped, that the Church, in regard to its temporalities, would be settled.

Other reasons may have influenced him also. By the unwise policy of the diocesans, who happened to be in possession of the sees \* when Elizabeth succeeded to the throne, the queen's government had been obliged to select for the episcopal office many of the exiles, who, returning to England on the death of Queen Mary, were Puritans at heart, though prepared to make sacrifices of principle in order to obtain, or to be restored to, a share in the emoluments of the Church. We have shown, in the preceding chapter, that two-thirds of the clergy were Anglo-Catholics, that is, Catholics opposed to the pope, though still more hostile to Calvin. These were prepared for certain reforms consequent upon a separation from Rome, but, though conforming, they desired to

CHAP.  
XIII.

Matthew  
Parker.

1559-75.

Prefer-  
ment of  
the exiles.

\* When we speak of a bishop, we mean a person in episcopal orders, without, of necessity, having any diocese under his control. Thus we speak of a clergyman, a man in priest's orders. He becomes a rector or vicar when to a rectory or vicarage he receives an appointment ; and, in like manner, a bishop becomes a diocesan when he receives appointment to a diocese, which diocese he may resign, although he still remains, as before, a man empowered to ordain, to confirm, to consecrate. The diocese is the territorial extent over which a bishop, elected to a diocese, has episcopal jurisdiction, as a parish is the territorial extent of a priest. The *see* is the bishop's seat (*sedes*) or throne in his cathedral, which name is applied to the church containing the throne, and to the city from which he takes his title. See this whole subject treated of with his usual precision by Mr. Freeman in his "History of Cathedrals of the Old Foundation."

CHAP.  
XIII.Matthew  
Parker.  
1559-75.Visitation  
of Canter-  
bury.Nature of  
inquiries.

retain as much of the ancient ceremonies as they dared. The archbishop might fairly suspect, that from Puritan intolerance on the one side, and the perverseness of some of the Anglo-Catholics on the other, the peace of the Church might be disturbed.

Of the character of the visitation, as he intended it, we have a description, in the account retained of the visitation of Canterbury. His own diocese was, like other dioceses, to be visited first by commission. Parker was always methodical, and he carefully prescribed the order which his commissioners were to pursue. The rule at that time was, that before the visitation of a diocese, the visitation of the cathedral should first take place. Through the various inquiries, which the commissioners were directed to make, we obtain some insight into the condition of the Church. The commissioners were directed to attend matins at the cathedral. It is remarkable that this visitation began with an irregularity not afterwards followed. The archbishop directed that (at morning prayer) the lessons should be omitted, in order that more time might be allowed for the sermon. The economical temper of his grace was perceived and applauded. He regulated the fees, and placed a check upon the exorbitant demands which had been formerly made and, by the corrupt ecclesiastical courts, enforced. No clerk who had to write the presentment of the clergy or their answer was permitted to charge more than four pence for the duty he had to perform, which included a provision of clean paper.

In those days, when little restraint was placed on the passions of men in their youth, quarrels were frequent; and in reconciling differences much of the commissioners' time was consumed. Inquiry was made as to the residence of the dignitaries, and whether they used seemly

and priestly garments according as they were commanded, or not.

The commission descended to minute particulars, for they had to make report of the apparel in which they commonly appeared. Inquiry was also made whether divine service was performed and the Sacraments administered according to the prescribed form and none other, and whether the service “was said or sung in due time.”

Questions were asked which seemed to bear with perfect fairness on each of the two great parties in the Church. On the one hand, inquiry was made whether the royal supremacy was, according to ancient custom, acknowledged; on the other hand, whether the clergy “extolled any superstitions or relics, pilgrimages, lighting of candles, kneeling, decking of images, or praying in a tongue not known, rather than in English; whether they exhorted men to put trust in a certain number of pater nosters, or to maintain purgatory, private masses, or trentals.”

It will be here observed, that it was taken for granted, that the commissioners would find some of these superstitions existing in some of the parishes. When we are asked why was this the case, we find an answer in the fact, that the majority of the parishes being in the hands of the Anglo-Catholics, there was still an inclination, on the part of some of the clergy, to think that they had conceded enough when they had renounced the authority of the pope. The querists, at the same time, directed their inquiries in the opposite direction: no Catholic would deny the necessity of infant baptism, but this was a point on which the Puritans very frequently expressed a doubt. The commissioners demanded whether there were any—in parishes, not under the surveillance of Anglo-Catholics—“who were known to say, teach, or

CHAP.  
XIII.

Matthew  
Parker.  
1559-75.

Questions  
bearing  
upon the  
Puritans.



CHAP.  
XIII.

Matthew  
Parker.

1559-75.

maintain, that children being infants should not be baptized; or that every article of our creed, commonly received and used in our Church, was not to be believed of necessity;" or that mortal and voluntary sin committed after baptism was not remissible by penance; or that any man after he had received the Holy Ghost cannot sin and afterwards rise again by grace to repentance; or that it is not lawful to swear for certain causes; or that civil magistrates cannot punish, for certain crimes, a man with death.

On the one hand, they were to be admonished who insisted on the celibacy of the clergy; on the other hand, they were to be censured who held the ordinal in disrespect, and maintained that a man might act as a minister although he was never ordained.

Inquiries were made as to the temporalities of the Church. At the visitation of Canterbury Cathedral complaint was made of an irregularity of attendance at daily service on the part of some of the prebendaries. Among the "petty," or as they are now called "minor," canons, irregularities were found to exist; but it would appear that then, as now, the great accuser of the brethren had imitators whose pleasure it was to rail at everything. We may give as an instance a complaint made, that the arms of the late archbishop, Reginald Pole, were surmounted by a cardinal's hat, which the accusers thought, as stated in the words of the presentment, "was not decent nor tolerable, but abominable, and not to be suffered."

In the articles drawn up for the direction of the commissioners in the other dioceses, inquiry was ordered to be made, whether in the parish churches there were things requisite and necessary for Common Prayer and the administration of the Sacraments.

Among these were specified the Book of Common

Prayer, a Bible “of the largest volume,” the homilies with the paraphrases of Erasmus, a convenient pulpit well placed, a comely and decent table for the Holy Communion set in the place described in the queen’s majesty’s injunctions, together with a poor box. The commissioners were to ascertain whether any persons intruded themselves into the ministry without having received regular ordination; an investigation was to be made into the morals of the clergy and of the state of patronage. It appears that the old practice was not abolished by which, as in the case of Reginald Pole, a layman, or even a child under education for holy orders, might enjoy the emoluments of a benefice, placing one whom we should now call a curate to perform the duties. It was customary to say, that the parishioners were not concerned in the agreement made between a beneficiary and his deputy so long as the duty was well performed. The sophistry contained in this position was enlarged upon, when the clergy had families to support; this inquiry therefore indicates a movement in the right direction.\* In the same spirit inquiries were now made into pluralities and simoniacal contracts. Among the inquiries, we find one designed for the purpose of detecting whether in the parish any could be found “that used witchcraft, sorcery or enchantment, magic, incantation, or necromancy.”

CHAP.  
XIII.  
Matthew  
Parker.  
1559-75.

Simoniacal  
contracts.

Witch-  
craft.

In this visitation, conduct came to light which led to a revision of the marriage laws, of which mention has been made in a former chapter. It was found that many had married within the degrees of affinity and consanguinity by the laws of God forbidden. In some instances it was discovered that a man had, and was not ashamed to avow

\* This subject will come under consideration in a subsequent chapter, when we shall have to treat of the Court of Faculties.

CHAP.  
XIII.  
Matthew  
Parker.  
1559-75.

it, two wives; while other cases were produced establishing the fact, that one woman would sometimes have two husbands. That marriages should be performed without banns being first asked, was rather a necessary consequence of such a state of things; if it were not perhaps more correct to surmise that they were the cause rather than the consequence; since, if banns had been asked, the iniquity would have been almost proclaimed in the sight of the Church, which, though lax in inquiry, would not have tolerated a manifest defiance of the moral law on the part of those who professed and called themselves Christians. The archbishop insisted on a strict observance of the law in this regard; but the commissioners reported that persons were living in adultery, openly, and without being avoided by their neighbours.\*

The commission lasted for three years, during which time, by a union of firmness, courtesy, and justice, the archbishop secured the good-will and co-operation of the majority of his suffragans. In the midsummer of 1563, he went down to Canterbury to conduct personally his diocesan visitation. As usual with Parker, he kept up considerable state. His desire was to appear, as his predecessors had been accustomed to do, as a prince of the Church. His suite consisted of not fewer than forty persons; and when we bear in mind that a traveller prosecuted his journey, not in a carriage, but on horseback; that his attendants, if not all of them mounted, had to attend to the sumpter horses or mules, and that these were followed by a mixed multitude eager for perquisites, we are not surprised at hearing, that an episcopal visitation was regarded with feelings very different from

Visited his  
diocese in  
person.  
1563.

\* Parker's Register, reprinted in Strype's Collectanea.

those which now prevail. To his suffragans Archbishop Parker set a good example by refusing the customary perquisites, by which the visitor was in former times saved from expense, if not actually enriched. Parker caused all expenses to be charged to his own private account. The palace of Canterbury being in ruins, he took up his abode at his favourite residence of Bekesbourne, which he had lately repaired, and, instead of being entertained by his clergy, he invited them to partake of the hospitality of their diocesan. He kept an open table for the clergy of the diocese and for the gentlemen of the county; and as participators of his hospitality the poor were especially welcome.

CHAP.  
XIII.

Matthew  
Parker.

1559-75.

The state of the country was at this time precarious; the plague had already broken out in London, and there was a scarcity of food in Canterbury. At the latter end of the month of July, therefore, he invited the Mayor of Canterbury and his commonalty to meet him in the cathedral church one Friday morning. When they were assembled, the archbishop himself addressed them from his throne, and exhorted them in his sermon to engage in earnest prayer. He then appointed every Friday for the future, "until this tyranny was over past," to be set apart for prayer and preaching in the cathedral. In the parish churches he directed the observance, for the same purpose, on Mondays and Wednesdays. Having given these orders in the city of Canterbury, the archbishop, aware of the jealous temper of the queen, began to fear that he should provoke her anger if, without first obtaining her permission, he issued similar directions for the whole province. He therefore communicated immediately with the secretary, and expressed his surprise that he had not already received a command from the government to

Prayer and  
fasting.



CHAP.  
XIII.

Matthew  
Parker.

1559-75.

draw up a form of prayer, and to appoint a certain day for fasting.

He anticipated the objection, namely, that he and his suffragans had sufficient authority by their sacred vocation to regulate such an affair as this, by remarking that, although such authority they, in right of their office, certainly did possess, yet certain limits to the exercise of their powers had been assigned by the statutes and laws of the land. Cecil immediately laid the case before the queen, who directed an official letter to be sent to the archbishop, in which she says: "We do not only commend and allow your good zeal therein, but also do command all manner our ministers, ecclesiastical or civil, and all other our subjects, to execute, follow, and obey such godly and wholesome orders as you, being primate of all England and metropolitan of this province of Canterbury, upon godly advice and consideration, shall uniformly devise, prescribe, and publish for the universal usage of prayer, fasting, and other good deeds during the time of this visitation by sickness and other troubles."

Fast ap-  
pointed.

Unfortunately, Cecil, desirous to remedy any evil which might result from delay, requested the Bishop of London—Grindal—without loss of time, to draw up a form of prayer. For such a work Grindal was incompetent; and Parker had the mortification of receiving a form which he could not publish without much revision and correction; while to revise and correct what was drawn up by so good a man as Grindal was an invidious task.

He did not, however, shrink from his duty. Grindal, indeed, had drawn up a form corresponding in tone to Puritan formularies: Archbishop Parker had based his order of prayer on the form prescribed in the Prayer Book; he changed the Lessons and the Psalms, which

was all that was required, and added to it, out of consideration to Grindal, a portion of the long prayer which the bishop had composed. He was unable to repress his regret at the want of the Liturgical tone, and complained of its being one long prayer instead of its being broken up into collects. Then followed an order for the general fast. It was ordained that the Wednesday in every week should be set apart for that purpose.

All persons between the years of sixteen and sixty (sick folk and labourers in harvest and other great labours only excepted) were to eat one only competent and moderate meal upon every Wednesday, in which said meal was to be used "very sober and spare diet without variety of kinds of meat, dishes, spices, confections, or wines; but only such as might serve for necessity, comeliness, and health:" in that meal it was indifferent to eat flesh or fish, so that the quantity was small and no variety or delicacy were sought. They who were in health were enjoined on that day to abate and diminish the costliness and variety of their fare, and increase therewith their liberality and alms to the poor. On that day they were to "forbear from bodily labour, and pass the time in reading of Scripture and prayer; but no part thereof was to be spent in plays, pastimes, or idleness, much less in lewd, wicked, and wanton behaviour."

Among the duties of his visitation, the archbishop included an inspection of hospitals and schools. Existing schools he reformed, where reformation was needed; and, by his own munificence, new schools he established, where no means of instruction had been previously appointed. We have an account of his visitation of a free school at Sandwich, which he was instrumental in founding. We may take it as a sample of the energy he exhibited at this time of his life, when the illness of which

CHAP.  
XIII.

Matthew  
Parker.

1559-75.

Nature of  
the fast  
enjoined.

Visitation  
of hos-  
pitals and  
schools.

CHAP .  
XIII.

Matthew  
Parker.

1559-75.

Visitation  
of Sand-  
wich.

he complained not long before seems to have departed from him. The inhabitants of Sandwich offered to build a school at their own charge if the dean and chapter of Canterbury were willing to grant an acre of land possessed by them within the walls of the town. After solicitation of the archbishop, the dean and chapter made the grant. He also obtained her majesty's sanction for this alienation of Church property, and from her he recovered the schoolmaster's stipend. He also obtained a scholarship at Caius College, Cambridge, and two scholarships at Lincoln College, Oxford, for the endowment of the school.

When all the arrangements had been completed, the archbishop determined to visit the spot. He mounted his horse early one Sunday morning, and rode to Sandwich, distant about six miles, arriving there at seven o'clock; his object in going so early was, to prevent the formalities of a public reception, and in order that he might be in good time for divine service. The morning was dull and heavy, but the mayor and his jurats were found already standing at the town gate, prepared to accompany his grace, first to his lodging, then to the church.

The archbishop was extremely pleased with the place and its inhabitants. He described the mayor and his jurats as "comely and grave persons, and of good understanding: their streets were as clean as might be for the straitness of them." At church the service, he remarked, "was sung in good distinct harmony, and quiet devotion;" the singing men were the mayor and the jurats, with the leading gentlemen of the town, seated in the choir in as good order as he could wish. The archbishop himself preached before an auditory large and attentive: he took occasion to enforce the observance of the fast, and paid them the compliment of saying, that he felt sure that

the queen's majesty had in them "good subjects and good orators."

CHAP.  
XIII.

Matthew  
Parker.

1559 75.

He paid a compliment to their minister, a grave and learned man, by appointing him to exercise, by his grace's authority, the ecclesiastical censures as he should see cause, of which, he was pleased to say with a smile, "little had been spied."

The archbishop expressed his great delight at seeing such good order in so remote a portion of his diocese. He wrote an account of it to the secretary, to induce him to act with even greater zeal than heretofore, in the cause of education.

The satisfaction which the archbishop felt with what he witnessed at Sandwich, extended to all parts of his diocese. He made a report to this effect to Cecil. He mingled with all classes of people, with the laity as well as with the clergy, with the poor as well as the rich. Among the former he endeavoured to promote the cause of peace and of good order, while he sought to make the upper classes instrumental in furthering the queen's service and the national welfare.

A report reached him of the evil condition of his peculiars in the province of York: Blackburn and Whalley had been grossly neglected; but he was informed by the Bishop of Durham, that, acting in concurrence with the Archbishop of York, his grace's officials might easily remedy these defects. Of the Bishop of Chester complaint was made, that he taxed his clergy for visitation fees, but avoided the trouble of a visitation. The bishop's plea for this neglect was, that he did not like to trouble the clergy by summoning them to a meeting. Of the Bishop of Man it was said, that, instead of residing at his diocese, he was living at his ease in England, "as merry as Pope Joan."

Archi-  
episcopal  
peculiars.



CHAP.  
XIII.Matthew  
Parker.  
1559-75.State of  
Canter-  
bury Ca-  
thedral.

The archbishop received a report from his commissary of the state of his own cathedral. In this it was stated, that the preachers were orthodox in doctrine; that the Common Prayer was sung daily throughout the year, even when there was no communion, at the communion table, which stood in the usual place of the altar. The minister, when there was no communion, appeared in a surplice only: he stood at the east side of the table facing the people. When the holy communion was administered, the celebrant, the epistler, and the gospeller were arrayed in their copes; no one was suffered to remain in the chancel except communicants. For the administering of the holy communion wafer-bread was used, such as was directed by the injunctions, "resembling the singing cakes which served formerly for the use of private masses." The evening prayer in winter was between three and four o'clock, in summer between four and five; at these prayers, the dean and the prebendaries appeared in the choir apparelled.\* When they preached they wore the surplice and silk hoods. All the officers of the establishment, petty canons, lay clerks, and choristers, with the schoolmasters and scholars of the grammar school, always appeared, when in the choir, arrayed in surplices. It was certified that, as touching the manners, usages, and behaviour of the preachers and other ministers within their church, the dean and canons were not acquainted with any who led disorderly lives or who were regardless of the injunctions issued by his grace.

While the archbishop was attending to the business of his own diocese, the provincial visitation was still in pro-

\* The apparel was a square or oblong ornament embroidered, stitched on the collar of the amice, and at the bottom of the albe, before and behind, and on the wrists.

gress; though it was not till 1567 that the commissioners were able to complete their report.

CHAP.  
XIII.

Matthew  
Parker.  
1559-75.

Regula-  
tions for  
preachers.

The archbishop soon found that great irregularities had taken place with respect to preaching. Many of the clergy, being unable to preach, were obliged to appoint deputies, who demanded money payments for their sermons. The preachers were, for the most part, Puritans, and all manner of strange doctrine was propagated. By the Anglo-Catholics preaching was much neglected. The archbishop called in all the licences that had been previously granted, and required new licences to be taken out, but would not permit any fees to be paid for the same. The report of the Bishop of Bangor represented the condition of his diocese as lamentable in the extreme. In the whole diocese he had only two preachers, and complaint was made, that strong party-feeling prevailed among the native Welsh. When the see was vacant, it was reported that no one but a Welshman could expect to succeed in the episcopal office. Through the influence of the archbishop, Dr. Robinson was appointed, a Welshman respected for his learning, and popular in the diocese. He was able to report a manifest improvement in 1567. He assisted the archbishop in his antiquarian researches.

Com-  
plaints  
made by  
diocesans.

The Bishop of Peterborough had just reason to complain of the ill-treatment which some of his clergy experienced from the malcontents of his diocese. Clergymen were brought into the ecclesiastical courts when no real charge could be substantiated against them, merely for the purpose of subjecting them to vexation and insult. The parishioners of Wistenden actually put their vicar into the stocks; and their example had been followed by another parish, the bishop affirming that this was done,

CHAP.  
XIII.Matthew  
Parker.  
1559-75.

not from any just cause, but merely out of contempt for the ministry.

The Bishop of Carlisle complained of the alienation of Church property.

These cases are given as specimens of the difficulties which the archbishop had to encounter. The majority of the prelates themselves applied the remedy when an evil was discovered ; but some there were, like those just mentioned, who, from inability or indolence, forced the archbishop to undertake the duty which properly devolved exclusively upon themselves.

Visitation  
of Nor-  
wich.

That which caused him most annoyance was the visitation of the diocese of Norwich, his native place. The diocese was in an unsatisfactory state, and the bishop himself, Dr. Parkhurst, was not equal to the occasion. The diocese of Norwich had not been visited for seven years. To the visitation, the clergy and the people, on account of the expense, had been successfully opposed ; and the bishop, unwilling to provoke hostility, had yielded to a custom which he regarded as the common law of the diocese—a septennial visitation. On May 8, 1567, the archbishop issued a mandate, inhibiting the diocesan, and appointing his commissioners to summon his lordship, as well as his clergy, to undergo a metropolitan visitation. The bishop was to appear by his proctor lawfully constituted, or by his vicar-general in spirituals. Articles of inquiry were issued ; and, as usual, with Parker's sound judgment, they were designed to bring the two great parties to friendly terms through mutual concessions.

Articles of  
inquiry.

Of the Anglo-Catholics it was demanded, whether they admitted the queen to be the chief governor in Church and State. Of the Puritan party inquiry was made, whether they observed the ancient rites and ceremonies of the Church. Inquiry was also made, whether there

were any who denied the authority of any provincial or national Church to reform the ordinances : on the other hand, the question was put to the Puritans, whether they assumed the right of making alterations by private authority. If, in the administration of the ordinances, superstitious observances were to be eschewed, the decorous observance of those ordinances was carefully to be maintained. The commissioners were to inquire whether there were any who declaimed against infant baptism, or refused to accept any article of the Apostles' Creed : whether there were any who asserted, that persons might minister in the sanctuary without having been duly ordained. While these investigations were in progress as against ultra-Protestants, the bowing to images, the reverence for relics, pilgrimages, and other observances having a real tendency towards popery, were denounced, as against the Anglo-Catholics. To these articles reference has now been made for the purpose of showing the fairness with which Parker exercised his jurisdiction, when he was beyond the control of the civil government.

As the custom had long been, the visitation commenced at the cathedral. Here, and throughout the diocese, the archbishop complained that simony was rampant. In several places it was proved that seven or eight benefices were held by one man, while other parishes were kept vacant in order that a lay impropriator might apply to his own purposes the revenues of the Church. Some churches were closed, no provision having been made for the support of the parson ; hereby, as Parker remarked, the Church was fleeced, and the queen was defrauded of the benefit resulting from the prayers of her subjects, for in the efficacy of prayer, faith was, at that time, fully entertained. It is by prayer, in union with exertion, that we obtain our ends and objects. Prayer without exertion

CHAP.  
XIII.

Matthew  
Parker.

1559-75.

Norwich  
Cathedral  
visited.

Efficacy of  
prayer.



CHAP.  
XIII.Matthew  
Parker.

1559-75.

Corrodies.

is mockery; exertion without prayer for a blessing on exertion is profaneness. While the queen and her ministers laboured in council; as the soldiers under her command, fought her battles; so a blessing was brought down upon the exertions both of statesmen and soldiers by the prayers daily offered by the national Church for national blessings. It was discovered, upon inquiry, that in the cathedrals prebends were frequently conferred upon laymen. Noblemen and gentlemen assigned to their serving-men the dividends attaching by right to prebendal stalls. These persons were unable to perform the spiritual functions for the discharge of which prebends were endowed; and they were, at first, preparing to deny the archbishop's right to summon them to his court. They might fairly expect lenient treatment from their own diocesan, Bishop Parkhurst; for he was himself an offender in this respect. But the archbishop, although he had the power to grant dispensations, through the Court of Faculties, could not be interested in their favour. Consequently, since they could not deny his authority in general, they contended, as on behalf of the bishop, that, in visiting Norwich, the archbishop was attempting to exercise his authority in a place where a bar to its lawful exercise existed.

The offence here complained of was not productive of that scandal which in the nineteenth century would attach to it. The reader will remember the corrodies, that existed in the monasteries when the monastic system prevailed in our Church. Certain founders and benefactors would reserve the right of assigning a portion of the corporate or capitular income to younger members of their families; they would thus appropriate pensions to their superannuated dependents; or provide an income for young persons *in statu pupillari* in one of the Universities. We can easily understand how, under a careless diocesan,

this principle might be brought to bear upon the income of cathedrals. This was precisely one of those things which required a reformation. We can, therefore, understand the annoyance of the archbishop, when he found his friend Lord Keeper Bacon, a zealous reformer, offending in this particular. With his friend, Parker privately remonstrated. But notwithstanding the private nature of the remonstrance, Bacon, being an irritable man, was extremely indignant. The archbishop had written a friendly letter; but, in reply, he received a sharp verbal message through one of the lord keeper's servants, who was directed to say, that the lord keeper "conceived *that* now of the archbishop which he thought not to have heard at his hands." He undoubtedly expected the archbishop's connivance at what Bacon himself regarded as one of the perquisites of high office. He wished well for the Church, but for his patronage of the Church, he thought he might fairly claim, through a slice of the Church's property, a remuneration.

Parker was deeply annoyed, and he straightway addressed a letter to Lady Bacon, to intercede in his behalf with the lord keeper. The letter itself, which we still possess, is a model of what such a letter ought to be from a person, who, while determined to do his duty, is willing to make any legitimate sacrifice for the purpose of retaining or regaining the favour of an offending friend. It speaks much for the goodness of Parker's heart. He tells Lady Bacon, who was always ready to perform kind offices, that so far from wishing to make public what he regarded as an offence on the part of a friend, he had not even communicated it to his wife. Howsoever his conduct might be taken by his friend, Parker affirmed, that he desired to act, not only prudently,

CHAP.  
XIII.

Matthew  
Parker.

1559-75.

Quarrel  
with the  
Lord  
Keeper  
Bacon.

Letter  
to Lady  
Bacon.

CHAP.  
XIII.

Matthew  
Parker.

1559-75.

but in a Christian, godly, and friendly manner. He had written in vain to his old friend, and he adds :—

“Concerning the matter itself, I am sure I did so reasonably write, that if he had been the prince of the realm, and I but his chaplain, I might have written privately, as I did.

“And where he findeth lack in me that I did so write, peradventure I might find some lack in him for not staying his displeasure till he had known what great cause I had to write ; yea, much more than I did write, both in conscience and in good love of friendship. Madam, be not offended with my plainness, as though I would make comparison with him. I know his office, I know his gifts of God and his place, and yet may Matthew Parker write privately to Nicholas Bacon, in matter of good friendship, without offence. In all humility of heart, I will not stick to submit myself to his page of his chamber, and will be admonished by him in reason, though he were mine enemy ; and again, in doing my office to God, and my duty of friendship to them whom I will sincerely love and honour.”

He proceeded to inform Lady Bacon of the simoniacal transactions to which allusion has already been made. He informs her that the lord keeper was presented to him, for having appointed a layman to a prebend in the cathedral of Norwich—a mere serving man ; another prebendary was supported by the lord keeper in the neglect of his prebendal duties, being employed on some service in his household.\* He calls upon Lady Bacon to “eliminate out of his house this offendicle, and to restore him to the friendship he valued so highly.”

Bacon was probably the more exasperated, because

\* It is thus I understand the archbishop's expression, though the sentence is rather obscure.

there were scarcely any of the courtiers who were not guilty of a similar offence, from which the queen herself was not exempt. It is interesting to refer, on this occasion, to the conduct of the queen, since it throws a light upon the treatment which her ministers received at her hands. Bacon, assisted by other courtiers, narrated doubtless what had taken place in the diocese of Norwich, leading the queen to infer that, when the archbishop condemned her courtiers, the censure by implication touched the queen herself. She certainly attacked the archbishop, addressing him in those hard words, which, in her insolence, she was not slow to employ. Parker observes of it, that with one ear he heard her hard words, and with the other, and in his conscience and heart, he heard his God. The courtiers did not escape the queen's observation when the primate was upbraided by the sovereign he so dearly loved. Her selfish vanity was gratified by the pleasure expressed by those who felt secure in their malpractices by the countenance they received from the queen; but her kindness of heart and sound policy soon turned the tables. The very next day the queen crossed over into the Lambeth fields. The archbishop went to meet her at the bridge; she received him with a kind look, and before all the people she was seen whispering secretly into his ear: he stood forth before the public, therefore, as her minister on confidential terms with his royal mistress. The astonished courtiers were compelled to see that there were state secrets, on which she would confer with her primate, and from a participation in which they were excluded; and they could not but feel that in such private conferences, a word of disparagement might be uttered, though reaching no ear except that of the queen. She might join in the laugh raised against a shy and

CHAP.  
XIII.Matthew  
Parker.

1559-75.



CHAP.  
XIII.Matthew  
Parker.  
1559-75.Diocesan  
visitation  
of 1570.

nervous courtier; but the queen's minister should be treated with respect.

While the archbishop was visiting the various dioceses of his province by commission, he made several visitations of his own diocese in person. Of these visitations we have an account, more or less in detail. On Ascension-day in 1570, he preached in the cathedral of Canterbury, before a large congregation of clergy as well as of laity. He afterwards preached in the various parish churches of his diocese. On Whit Sunday he held a great feast in the hall of his palace, and, emulating the hospitality of former times, he continued the festivities on Whit Monday and Whit Tuesday. To these banquets, which we shall hereafter have to describe, were invited not only the clergy, but the citizens of Canterbury and their wives. He acquired popularity among the citizens by a renewal of the ancient right and custom, often disregarded, according to which the consecrations of bishops were to be conducted in the metropolitan church. Bishop Barlow, the prelate who had presided at the archbishop's own consecration, died in August 1568. The archbishop used his influence to obtain the vacant bishopric for his chaplain, Richard Courtis,\* whom he now had the pleasure of consecrating. Out of regard for his chaplain, who was not in affluent circumstances, he himself paid the fees and pretermitted the perquisites accruing to himself. The archbishop was assisted on this occasion by the Bishop of London, now the elect of York, by the Bishop of Winchester, Dr. Horn, and by Edmund Gheast, Bishop of Rochester. In honour of these prelates, the festivities were renewed on Trinity Monday. We are told that it was a noble feast, which might justly be called *convivium archiepiscopale*: † for,

\* Parker's Register, quoted by Stubbs, *Registrum Anglicanum*, p. 84.

† Matthæus.

although Grindal was not yet confirmed, he was, as the elect of York, invested with the temporal dignity of his station; and two primates of England honoured the assembly by their presence. The day was selected in honour of King Henry VIII., a monarch who still retained his popularity, and to whom the cathedral establishment at Canterbury was under peculiar obligations,—at least so thought the clergy of that age: Henry VIII. had displaced the regulars, who had been in possession of that church from the time of Lanfranc, by whom the seculars had been ousted.

The monks, when they formed the chapter of the cathedral, could not be accused of any want of hospitality. It was probably to prevent a disparaging comparison between the seculars and the former dignitaries of this church, that the archbishop made this great display. In everything in which Parker was concerned he showed a love of order and regularity. On this occasion the ministers, by whom is meant the singing men and the lay officials of the cathedral, were placed at tables arranged at the lower end of the hall, together with the children, both those who sang in the choir and those who were educated at the school. In the same hall the poor of both sexes, belonging to the hospitals of St. John's and Herboldown, were feasted; that, says the historian, "by looking on them when they were feasting, these archbishops and bishops might, in their present height, remember the merciful God that had wrought great deliverances for them, and had brought them to that state out of their former dangers and calamities, when they themselves were poor and distressed: as the pious archbishop meant by so placing them."\*

CHAP.  
XIII.

Matthew  
Parker.

1559-75.

\* Strype, i. 21.

CHAP.  
XIII.Matthew  
Parker.

1559-75.

Grindal  
confirmed  
Arch-  
bishop of  
York.

The clergy having been assembled for visitation, Parker, as primate of all England, confirmed Archbishop Grindal, with much attention to the requisite ceremonial; being assisted by the Bishops of Winchester and Rochester.

On the 3rd of July the business of the visitation, properly so called, was resumed. Prayers were said, and the Holy Eucharist was celebrated in the chapter-house; the celebrant being one of the archbishop's chaplains, though the dean and other clergy of the cathedral were present. If the service had been performed in the choir, the dean and prebendaries would have referred to the precedent, and they would have claimed to officiate. The visitation was held in the bishop's own court; and in every diocese, the bishop seems to have retained a right to exercise his authority in the chapter-house. The visitation was continued from day to day until the 22nd of July.

Visitation  
continued.

Although he prorogued the visitation to the feast of the Purification of the Blessed Virgin, no visitation was actually held after the date just given. Day by day, during that period, he issued wholesome injunctions to the clergy and laity, though we can hardly say, that he delivered a charge in the modern sense of that word. A charge has, indeed, come to be considered as little more than the publication of a triennial pamphlet on the part of the diocesan. The original notion was that, as a judge to a grand jury, the head of a diocesan court, having ordinary jurisdiction, whether as bishop, archdeacon, or chancellor, should point out to the representatives of the people summoned to the court, what their duties were; while the ordinary himself declared to them the discipline which he intended to adopt for enforcing the canons so as to bring them into accordance with the statutes of the realm. It may not be uninteresting to lay before the

reader the order of proceeding as appointed by the archbishop for each succeeding day.\*

At eight o'clock in the morning there was service in the choir. When the service was over, the choir, and all persons connected with the foundation, including the schoolmasters and scholars, were arranged in due order, on either side, in the middle aisle. When all was arranged, a procession was formed, consisting of the dean, the prebendaries, and the six preachers, who passed on to the palace, there to attend "my lord's grace" to the church. Arrived at the west door, his grace was received by the choir, which preceded him singing an anthem. When the choir was reached, and each official had taken his place, the Litany was sung.

The Litany having been sung according to the regulations of the Church, the grammarians and the choir went in procession, two and two, into the presbytery; and passing behind the choir by Bishop Wallen's Chapel, they entered into the chapter-house. At the stair's head they were met by the archbishop, the dean, the prebendaries, and the preachers. These, and these only, together with the officers of the archbishop's household, were permitted intra cancellos. There and then, before the service began, they sang the hymn, *Veni Creator*, in English. The dean then said the collect for grace, *Gratias agimus*, &c., in English: the sermon followed, after which those of the laity who were not connected with the cathedral were requested by the beadle to retire. The various authorities were required to bring in the several presentments, in writing, between the hours of three and four, on the same day and in the same place.

CHAP.  
XIII.

Matthew  
Parker.

1559-75.

\* Parker's Register, p. 281. "The archbishop," it is said, "delighted to do all his matters in a grave and solemn decency."



CHAP.  
XIII.Matthew  
Parker.

1559-75.

The dean, the vice dean, and the treasurer were required to deliver an inventory of the possessions of the church to my lord's grace. The vicars, the petty canons, and the singing men were to state in writing, how often they had, each one of them, received the Holy Communion since Easter last past. Two prebendaries were appointed to examine the school and to make report ; two other prebendaries were to examine those among the petty canons, vicars choral, and singing men, whose orthodoxy had been called in question, and to report to my lord's grace. The chanter, the master of the choristers and minor canons, were to examine the skill in the singing of the vicars,—singing men,—and the choir.

Upon another occasion, the archbishop issued certain injunctions founded on the reports, of which it is unnecessary to give an account.

Assizes  
held.

During the time of his visitation, on the 11th of July, the assizes were held. On this occasion the archbishop invited the judges, the high sheriff, the gentlemen, “and the common sort” all to dine with him in the great hall, where they were entertained with much splendour.

Confirma-  
tion of  
Bishop  
Sandys.

Before the primate left Canterbury and returned to London, Bishop Sandys arrived to be confirmed to the see of London as the successor of Grindal. This is noticed because there had been some previous misunderstanding between that prelate and the archbishop. They were now both of them pleased that the public should see that a reconciliation had taken place ; and as one of the charges brought against Sandys was his alleged avarice, the primate may not have been unwilling to let him see, that one of the ways to the hearts of men is through an ungrudging hospitality. -Soon after this, the archbishop removed to London, sleeping the first night at Sittingbourne ; dining the next day at Gravesend, his family was

removed up the Thames in barges, and arrived at Lambeth late at night.

In the accounts of his diocese which the archbishop sent to the secretary, he expressed himself generally satisfied with the state of affairs. This must have been chiefly owing to his vigilance, his firmness, and his hospitality. Under the lax discipline of his successor, Archbishop Grindal, the diocese so far deteriorated as to incur the just censures of Archbishop Whitgift.

Into further details with respect to Parker's visitations it will be unnecessary to enter, although, as illustrating the difficulties with which he had to contend, at one time, in his own cathedral, we may allude to the conduct of one of his prebendaries, Bullen by name, who is described as a hasty man. He accused the dean of speculation, and the charge appears to have been unjustly made: the dean had disposed by sale of some of the furniture of the cathedral, but he seems to have placed what he received to the general account. Of Mr. Bullen the dean complained, that he threatened to nail him to the wall with his sword: he had indeed to swear the peace against him. Dr. Bush was obliged to fly from him, to avoid his fists; which he succeeded in using against an unfortunate man named King. The chapter-house was not regarded by him as sacred, for there he inflicted chastisement on a lawyer who offended him; and when he was accused of using great oaths, he pleaded guilty to the charge, but he maintained that he did so only under great provocation.

Judging from the condition of his own cathedral, the archbishop felt, that the time had come when the cathedrals of the new foundation, as those were called which were established by Henry VIII., required the imposition of new statutes. In 1572, he obtained a

CHAP.  
XIII.

Matthew  
Parker.

1559-75.

Report of  
his dio-  
cese.

Dispute  
between  
the dean  
and one of  
the  
canons.

Statutes of  
the new  
founda-  
tion.

CHAP.  
XIII.

Matthew  
Parker.

1559-75.

Con-  
cealers.

commission from the crown, and devoted much time and thought to the completion of this work which had been begun by Dr. Cranmer. In July, they presented what was called a book or report of the statutes to Sir William Cecil, then Lord Burghley, to obtain the sanction of the crown. Many years were, however, to elapse before that sanction could be obtained; for persons interested in the lax state of affairs, secured the intervention of the courtiers to prevent a measure which would have deprived them of their unlawful gains. Everybody appears to have been zealous, if in nothing else, in appropriating to themselves the property of the Church. There appeared a class of persons who were denominated Concealers: in the troublous times they seem, by leases or in other ways, to have obtained Church lands, for which the title-deeds were not forthcoming. The queen issued a commission to investigate this state of affairs, when many of the commissioners became almost as oppressive as the concealers themselves, and were eventually classed as such. They seized upon land devised for charitable purposes; upon the bells, the lead, and other things belonging to churches and chapels, which they exposed for sale; and by false title-deeds they seized lands, plate, and goods belonging to hospitals, and intended for the maintenance of the poor inmates. The archbishop persuaded the queen to revoke these commissions, and, for a time, the further iniquities of the concealers were prevented. "Thus were these harpies, and helluones," says Lord Coke, "this *turbidum hominum genus*, these graceless and wicked men, for a time laid asleep: but they awoke again at times, and plagued the nation throughout this queen's reign, and most of the next king's reign." These are Coke's own words.\* The peculations, indeed,

\* Strype's Annals, II. i. 312.

in every institution had become so great, that, although among the offenders most of the courtiers might be found, the government, for very shame, directed a visitation to be made, by the bishops, of all hospitals, and of those religious houses which had been preserved from the spoliation of the reformers. This mandate Parker obeyed, though with much caution, and he visited all the hospitals and other charitable institutions which had been established by his predecessors.

CHAP.  
XIII.

Matthew  
Parker.  
1559-75.

Hospitals  
visited.

It has been conjectured, that to this measure Parker was opposed. It was likely to render the Church unpopular with the courtiers, and the courtiers had the ear of the queen: it is possible, therefore, that Parker may have thought the measure impolitic or ill-timed; but it was not consistent with his general conduct to have offered an impediment to any measure of reform. The required visitation was certainly made in the diocese of Canterbury, together with a minute return of the condition of the hospitals, and that without loss of time. I say without loss of time, for Strype builds the conjecture to which allusion has just been made, on the supposed delay of the archbishop in carrying into effect the royal mandate. But, in assuming such delay, he is not supported by historical facts: the royal mandate was issued on the 12th of February, 1561, and Strype remarks, that the archbishop's return was not made till the 3rd of May, 1562; but this difficulty is met at once, when we observe, that Strype ought to have dated the issue of this mandate 12th of February, 1561-2.\* Certainly this is not an unreasonable length of time to be consumed in the holding the visitations and in framing the report. In the letter addressed, on the 2nd of May, 1562, to the barons of the

\* Parker's Register, p. 236.



CHAP.  
XIII.Matthew  
Parker.

1559-75.

Exchequer, a minute description is given of thirteen of the hospitals thus visited, together with an account of free schools established in Canterbury, at Wye, at Maidstone, at Tenterden,\* and other places. In the details given there is nothing that would interest the general reader, and the antiquary may be directed to the document itself.

Appoint-  
ment of a  
suffragan.  
1569.

The predecessors of Parker had usually employed one or more suffragan bishops for the performance of those spiritual offices which pertain exclusively to the episcopal order. Suffragans were thus appointed by Archbishop Warham, by Archbishop Cranmer, and by Cardinal Pole. Parker felt the importance of becoming personally acquainted with his clergy; and for that purpose he fixed upon Bekesbourne, near Canterbury, which he had purchased from Sir John Gage, to be his country residence: he hoped therefore to be able to perform his duties without the assistance of a suffragan; but, in the year 1569, he found the claims upon his time and attention as a metropolitan, to be greater than he, at first, expected, and that the duties of a diocesan, without further aid, would be neglected or very perfunctorily discharged. Every measure of reform emanated from his grace, while he had to produce his reasons for rejecting impracticable suggestions. At the same time, notwithstanding his determination not to allow his bodily ailments to interfere with his public duties, he found himself to be growing weaker in health; so that, at length, he arrived at the conclusion, that it would be criminal, on his part, not to avail himself of that assistance which the Church and State provided for him. In accordance with the Act of Parliament, he selected two persons, whose names were submitted to the queen in order that

\* Corresp. p. 166-170.

he might obtain her royal permission to consecrate, as his suffragan, the one on whom her choice should rest. He presented to her majesty Richard Rogers, B.D., the representative of an ancient Welsh family, together with John Butler, one of the prebendaries of Canterbury. The royal choice devolved on Richard Rogers; and he accordingly was consecrated at Lambeth, on the 15th of May, 1569. The archbishop himself officiated on the occasion, assisted by the Bishop of London and the Bishop of Rochester.\* The suffragan bore the title of Bishop of Dover, and held the office for twenty-eight years. In 1584, he became Dean of Canterbury, and did not die till 1597. The archbishop's health was, at this time, so precarious, that he was frequently obliged to absent himself from his parliamentary duties, and he found it expedient to appoint the Bishops of London and Ely to act as his proxies.

CHAP.  
XIII.

Matthew  
Parker.  
1559-75.

The labours of Parker at this period of his life would have been more than commonly arduous, even if we left out of consideration the infirm state of his health. Besides his provincial and diocesan visitations, he was called upon also to act as the visitor of the two Universities,—in his own right, so far as Oxford was concerned; and as the *amicus curiæ* to Sir William Cecil, in relation to Cambridge, of which University Sir William was the chancellor. With respect to the University of Oxford, he had discovered among the rolls of parliament, that in the year 1411 power was conferred upon the Archbishop of Canterbury, for the time being, to act as the visitor; and this claim seems never to have been disputed. This right, however, did not, of itself, imply an authority to visit the separate colleges.

Parker's  
industry.

Of All Souls' College he held a visitation as Archbishop

\* Parker's Register, apud Stubbs, p. 84.

CHAP.  
XIII.Matthew  
Parker.

1559-75.

Visitation  
of Corpus  
Christi  
College,  
Oxford.

of Canterbury; but when Corpus Christi College defied its visitor, the Bishop of Winchester, the primate did not claim any right to interpose on his behalf, or to supersede him; but he did what was worse, by calling in the aid of the royal commission. It is not difficult to understand why he may have desired to share with others the onus of this visitation: he probably found, upon inquiry, that while, on the one hand, the Fellows were not justified in defying their visitor, yet this defiance was provoked by the intolerant temper and violent party-spirit of Bishop Horn. In the University of Oxford the Anglo-Catholic party was strong; and it was especially strong in that college from which the judicious Hooker was to proceed. There were many in the University, and some in the college, who, offended and alarmed by the intolerance of the Puritans and the want of discipline in those dioceses over which Puritan bishops presided,—were provoked into an inclination to Romanism, preferring, if no other alternative were left them, the superstitions of Rome to the irreverence of Geneva. It is highly probable, that the royal commission became aware that Bishop Horn was not the man calculated to throw oil on these troubled waters. Between Romanism and Catholicism he could not make the proper distinction; but if his conduct was provocative of resistance, it was by no means a justification of it. By the interposition of the royal commission, Parker avoided collision with the Bishop of Winchester, and peace was restored. Parker did, indeed, gain his end, but he had established a bad precedent.

Although the archbishop, as the adviser of Cecil the chancellor, could exercise indirectly an influence over the University of Cambridge, yet even here he thought it expedient to bring the royal commission to bear upon the authorities of the place. Cecil's time was so fully

occupied, that he generally submitted to the dictation of the archbishop, given in the shape of advice. Parker naturally felt reluctant to urge measures which would redound to the unpopularity of the great minister; and, by calling in the royal commission, Cecil shared the responsibility with others.

CHAP.  
XIII.  
Matthew  
Parker.  
1559-75.

The state of things at Cambridge was the reverse of the principles and proceedings of the sister University. If the Puritans were strong at Oxford, the Anglo-Catholics were stronger still, and, by the gradual approximation of the two parties, the great Anglican school of divinity, under Richard Hooker, was coming into existence. At Cambridge the Anglo-Catholics, though strong, were nevertheless in a decided minority; and, as has always been the case, where Puritanism was strong it was also violent and intolerant. As an instance of the state of things, we may mention the following circumstance. In the absence from the University of Longworth, the Master of St. John's College, upwards of three hundred members of that college, with singular bad feeling, availed themselves of a festival of the Church to appear in the chapel without surplice or hood; and they continued the irregularity from that time until the return of the master—we might say, correctly, till *after* the master's return, for he made himself *particeps criminis* by taking no notice of an irregularity which was intended to be an act of defiant insubordination against the rules of the University, the regulations of the college, and the laws of the realm. Although some of the heads of houses urged the chancellor not to insist upon an observance of the ceremonies of the Church, yet the royal commissioners cited Longworth before them, and obliged him to sign and read a public apology for himself and his fellows.

Disturb-  
ances at  
St. John's.

If in what related to the University, the archbishop



CHAP.  
XIII.Matthew  
Parker.

1559-75.

Condition  
of Corpus  
Christi  
College,  
Cam-  
bridge.

was subjected to much mortification, the mortification was of a more personal character when complaint was made of the condition of his own college, Corpus Christi or Bene't. He met the difficulty by providing a new set of statutes for that house, a measure which he had previously intended to adopt. The quarrels of the members of the college, at this time, assumed a character which was greatly annoying to the archbishop. The master, Doctor Porie, was an old man, often absent, no disciplinarian, and in every respect deficient. He was, however, a personal friend of the archbishop, and he was frequently a guest of his grace at Lambeth. Parker could not deny, that he ought to be deposed; and his deposition might have been effected through the instrumentality of the royal commission, by the powers of which the primate had already interfered with the discipline of the University. Dr. Porie was a pluralist, but although, through the various claims upon his time, he was neglecting his duties to the college, he was willing to resign everything *except* the mastership. Parker was one of those good-natured men, who, though stern in enforcing general principles or public discipline, would shrink from giving annoyance when he had to deal with a personal friend.

Of Dr. Porie's character we know scarcely anything, but the leniency exercised towards him by his friend the archbishop was made by the enemies of the latter to reflect on the archbishop's own character. Although superannuated and incapable of performing the duties of his office, Porie was continued in the mastership, it was said, because he was reputed to be very rich, and the archbishop had hopes of becoming his executor. The charge is refuted by Parker's conduct on the occasion: he heard the report, and treated it with contempt. In a letter addressed to Sir William Cecil, and bearing date March 8,

Dr. Porie.

1570, he says: "Whereas I have this two or three years moved Dr. Porie to resign his mastership, whom I found always very loath so to do, I have been judged to look to be his executor, as though I stayed him in his mastership in hope of such expectation. The truth is, he is but a poor man, and in good faith I look not to be advantaged five shillings by him, nor shall be either his executor or supervisor if God should take him to his mercy; but he may live and spend all he has as far as I know."\* To this it is added by Dr. Masters and Dr. Lamb, that the archbishop was not mentioned in his will: he had not, as the archbishop asserted, much to leave.†

The archbishop's visitation of the Universities led him naturally to a similar visitation of the three great public schools, Winchester, Eton, and Westminster. New College and Christ Church at Oxford, and King's College, Cambridge, being closely connected with these schools, it is interesting to know the subject of his inquiries. He made it his business to ascertain whether the boys were perfect in the rules of grammar and versifying; and whether they were instructed in the principles of the Greek tongue and of rhetoric. ‡

We have already, in a former chapter, shown how Parker's attempt to effect an orthodox reformation was, through a combination of the two great parties, frustrated by the unjustifiable conduct of the papists. The Anglo-Catholics were becoming more and more persuaded, that they must submit to further measures of reformation. Making common cause with many who, without entirely agreeing with them, had ceased to be Puritans, the two parties in conjunction were evidently inclined to make a

CHAP.  
XIII.

Matthew  
Parker.

1559-75.

\* Corresp. p. 358.

† Masters' History of Corpus Christi College, edit. Lamb, p. 122.

‡ Strype, Appendix III. p. 111.

CHAP.  
XIII.Matthew  
Parker.  
1559-75.

common cause against extremes on either side. But the Seminarists—papists educated in foreign seminaries, where they were taught that the murder of the queen of England would be regarded in Spain and in Rome as a meritorious act—now made their appearance, and Elizabeth's life was in danger. Men were beginning to be alarmed, lest there should be a revival of the horrors of the late Queen Mary's reign; and these fears were brought to a climax, when the report reached England of the atrocities committed in Paris on August 24, 1572, St. Bartholomew's day. The alarm knew no bounds, when it was affirmed—and, we regret to say, truly affirmed—that, instead of anathematizing the actors in that tragedy, the Bishop of Rome had applauded, though he did not dare to canonize, the perpetrators of that great political crime, in a nation, whose history is stained by the records of deeds of darkness done in the excitement of civil warfare.

The Puritans, of course, made political capital out of these transactions; and for a season the Anglo-Catholics, being unjustly suspected, were obliged to remain in the background. In the general alarm, the aged archbishop participated. In his last letters to Cecil, now become Lord Burghley, he frequently, as we have before remarked, called upon him to have recourse to strong measures for the protection of Church and queen. In one of the letters, while writing in the terms of devoted friendship, he accused Burghley of a want of discretion, saying, that things were in such a state, that he was "himself at his wits' end." He warned him of the use to which such expressions might be applied by their common enemies. Of the evils resulting from such a state of things there will be much to be said in the life of Whitgift. In the mean time, we may here casually remark, that both the queen and her minister were evidently jealous of any inter-

ference in political subjects on the part of the primate. Till the time of Warham, and for some centuries before, the Archbishops of Canterbury had stepped out of their place, to become the ministers of the crown; and they were frequently seen to preside in the Court of Chancery. Against a recurrence of this state of things the queen and Burghley were resolute. The lawyers now formed a distinct and separate profession; and if the clergy devoted their bodies, their minds, and their spirits to the sacred duties of their high and holy calling, there would be neither time nor mind for secular pursuits. Once only from the days of Queen Mary, to the present hour, the attempt was made to reunite the secular and sacred duties in the person of a prelate; and Archbishop Laud, who made the attempt, lived long enough to lament his failure.

CHAP.  
XIII.Matthew  
Parker.

1559-75.



## CHAPTER XIV.

## JUDICIAL PROCEEDINGS.

Inns of Court.—Difficulties besetting a judge.—Ecclesiastical Commission.—Tendency of Puritanism to democracy.—Dr. Yale.—Parker's defence of Yale's appointment.—Court of Faculties.—Papal encroachments.—Archbishop's authority to supersede Papal dispensations.—Reform of Court impeded.—Court of Faculties an offensive Court.—Parker accused of partiality by Leicester.—Reformation of the Court of Faculties.—Case of Bigamy.—Singular case.—Case of Lady Katharine Grey.—Judgment given against her, and the Earl of Hertford, who claimed to be her husband.—Their imprisonment.—Lady Katharine's apartments in the Tower.—Lady Katharine committed to the custody of her uncle Lord John Grey when the plague was in London.—Her death.—Parker censured.—Lady Mary Grey.—Case of George Googe.—Cecil's interference.—Parker's conduct vindicated.—Reform of the Court of Arches.—Dr. Clarke.—Bornelius.

CHAP.  
XIV.

Matthew  
Parker.  
1559-75.

Difficulties  
as a judge.

THE multiplicity of offices in which Archbishop Parker was involved, rendered it impossible for him to excel in each. As a bishop he was a judge; but not having been educated as a lawyer, he admitted and regretted his inability to discharge to his own satisfaction, or that of others, his judicial functions. While attempting to reform the ecclesiastical courts, he could obtain from the practitioners of those courts very little assistance; so many being interested in the sustentation of corruptions which it was his object to remove. In seeking for a friendly adviser in the Inns of Court, he found among the benchers less sympathy than he had expected. The lawyers were

educated men; belonged chiefly to the Anglo-Catholic party in the Church; they were particularly disgusted with the violent proceedings and the iniquitous confiscations of the Puritans, or, as Parker called them, the Precisians; and this rendered them a more easy prey to the papists, when, coming from foreign parts, this party sought to sink the Anglo-Catholics from the *via media* into the depths of popery. They represented, that Puritanism could not be put down by half-and-half measures. A similar argument was adopted by the Puritans when, proceeding in the opposite direction, they sought the annihilation of the Anglicans. By Parker's influence the benchers and leading members of Inns of Court had hitherto been maintained in the *via media*; but even when this was their position, he was the adviser instead of the person seeking advice. The difficulty experienced in this respect, by Parker, many among his suffragans had also to encounter. Instead of strengthening the hands of the bishops by new enactments, the government appointed a commission for every diocese; and the commission, upholding the episcopal authority in theory rather than by their conduct, became itself unpopular. Complaint was made of various breaches of the ecclesiastical laws, which the diocesan courts were not strong enough to meet; and instead of arming those courts with new powers, an Ecclesiastical Commission was formed, in which the Puritans obtained, through their influence with Leicester, considerable influence. Although we have remarked, that to overcome a difficulty Parker would sometimes himself invoke the aid of the commission, instead of relying on the powers innate in his episcopal office, he nevertheless foresaw and predicted the mischief that would result from the course, which, suggested by Leicester, the queen and Cecil, in

CHAP.  
XIV.

Matthew  
Parker.  
1559-75.

Inns of  
Court.

Danger of  
popery.

Ecclesiastical Com-  
mission.

CHAP.  
XIV.Matthew  
Parker.

1559-75.

Tendency  
of Puritan-  
ism to De-  
mocracy.

the absence of their usual forethought, permitted to be pursued. The nobles, who were on the side of Leicester, supported the Puritans against the bishops. Parker, in a letter to Burghley, shrewdly remarked, that the tendency of Puritanism was to democracy, and that some were then living who might rue the day in which they countenanced a policy which would set on foot a commonwealth, or, as he called it, a "popularity."

Dr. Yale.

Under these circumstances the archbishop thought it expedient to appoint a legal adviser, and selected for the office Dr. Yale. This immediately provoked an opposition at court; and it was represented to the queen, that the archbishop, without permission, had delegated his authority to another. It was a measure certainly, at that time, without precedent, though, at the present day, this course is pursued by everyone who is called to discharge the duties of a responsible office, and to state what, on any given subject connected with his office, the law may be. So great, however, was the clamour, that the lord treasurer actually thought it worth his while to warn the archbishop of the state of feeling prevalent among the courtiers. Parker would not admit that there was any just ground for the complaint, for he observed, "When I know I can resolve the matter myself, I take none of his coat to be my councillors, but I will follow the council of them that fear God." Dr. Yale was a civilian, and it would appear that the attack upon Parker had partly reference to his not having appointed a clergyman. Parker in law matters consulted a man learned in the law—in a case of conscience he had other advisers.

Parker's  
defence of  
Yale's  
appoint-  
ment.The Court  
of Facul-  
ties.

It was with the Court of Faculties that Parker had his greatest trouble. The Faculty Court belonged to the archbishop, and his officer was called the Master of the

Faculties.\* Notwithstanding the Statute of Provisors, and other statutes referred to in the preceding volumes of this work, intended to control the papal encroachments upon the ecclesiastical jurisdiction of this realm, against all those statutes the pope's power still continued to prevail, until the twenty-first year of King Henry VIII.

CHAP.  
XIV.

Matthew  
Parker.  
1559-75.

These statutes, continually evaded, had reference chiefly to the matter of dispensations, which were to the apostolic see one of the chief sources of its revenue. By the statute passed in the year just mentioned, no person was permitted to send to the bishop or see of Rome, or to any person having, or pretending to have, any authority from the same, for any licences or dispensations whatsoever : but the Archbishop of Canterbury for the time being was to have power "to grant at his discretion, and by an instrument under his seal, unto the king, his heirs, and successors, all such licences, dispensations, compositions, faculties, grants, rescripts, delegacies, instruments, and all other writings for causes not being contrary to the laws of God, as had been used to be obtained by the king or any of his subjects at the see of Rome or any person by authority of the same." †

Papal  
encroach-  
ments.

Arch-  
bishop's  
authority  
to super-  
sede the  
papal dis-  
pensations.

It is easy to understand how troublesome must have been the management of such a court as this. The archbishop had power to grant dispensations as to marriages on prohibited days ; as to the holding of a plurality of benefices under conditions to be prescribed ; as to fasting ; and in regard to other deviations from the law.

Reform of  
the court  
impeded.

This was, as it were, a new court, or an old court with a new judge, the primate of England occupying the papal chair for certain specified purposes. Thus situated, the primate had very few precedents to guide him ; which,

\* 4 Inst. p. 337.

† Burn, edit. Phillimore, ii. 159.



CHAP.  
XIV.Matthew  
Parker.

1559 75.

Court of  
Faculties  
an offen-  
sive court.

this being a court of equity, is almost tantamount to saying that he had frequently not only to administer but to create the law; and at the very time when the archbishop was bent upon reform and upon a diminution of expenses to the suitor, his subordinates were too often found to encourage the litigation through which their fees were multiplied, and the advocates enriched at the suitor's cost. So great were the abuses, and so difficult all attempts of reformation, that the archbishop became desirous of abolishing the Court of Faculties, or, as he was bold enough in Convocation to call it, "that offensive court."

He contended, that methods might be devised for granting dispensations, when an exception to law might be occasionally required; whereas in the Court of Faculties, as it then existed—when, from the queen to the humblest of her subjects, each litigant thought, that an exception ought to be made, if not in favour of suitors generally, yet at least in his own particular case—it was scarcely possible for the judge to decide fairly without giving offence; for the real question was, how far the law could be used to enable a man to transgress the law with impunity. It is easy to understand how a court invested with such immense powers, bearing frequently upon the details of social life, should be unpopular; and how, the more just the judge, the more unpopular he would become, for it appeared that his ipse dixit was the law, and that if he had the will, he possessed the ability to satisfy every suitor. Parker felt acutely the attack made upon him, when he was held up to the indignation of the people, not only in the court, but in sermons and private letters. That he took a right view of the subject when he proposed the abolition of the court is clear from the fact, that, in the process of time, one by one, the powers of the court have passed into other jurisdictions.

As an instance of the difficulties with which the archbishop had to contend, we may mention the following case, having first premised, that an appeal for a dispensation, under the circumstances now to be mentioned, would not have shocked public opinion in Parker's age as it would do in ours.

CHAP.  
XIV.  
Matthew  
Parker.  
1559-75.

We must request the reader to bear in mind what has been said of corrodies. The founder or benefactor of a monastery could reserve to his family the right, in perpetuity, of taxing the religious house for the maintenance of certain members of his family, to be selected by its head. Henry VIII., having the power of granting corrodies in several religious houses, appropriated some of them to the education of Reginald Pole in either of the universities of England, or in any of the foreign universities. Sometimes a corrody was granted for the support of a distant relative, or of a dependent upon a family when he became too old to earn his livelihood, and required, therefore, a pension for his support. When the regular clergy were deprived of their monasteries, the sovereign and the nobles of the land, by whom the monasteries had been endowed, were deprived of their corrodies. But the cathedrals remained, and the nobles contended that stalls in the cathedrals might be granted on the principle of the ancient corrodies, and that the Court of Faculties might give permission to a boy under education, or a dependent favourite, to hold a prebend though unable to perform the duties of a prebendary. The queen claimed the right in this manner to find an income for her chaplains.\* To this innovation

Dispute  
with  
Leicester.

\* It was thus that the sovereign acquired the patronage of the stalls in certain cathedrals. Parker protested against her so appointing the stalls in Canterbury, but he failed; and to this day there are certain of the stalls in that cathedral under the patronage of the crown,

CHAP.  
XIV.Matthew  
Parker.

1559-75.

in regard to the patronage of cathedrals Parker was opposed. It was difficult to find preachers, and he desired to have the power of sending preachers from the cathedrals into parishes, when the clergy were incapable of performing this duty; and it was through the prebends by which they might be endowed, that he sought the remuneration of the men who had become sufficiently learned to instruct the people and to refute gainsayers by their sermons.

Under these circumstances, the archbishop on one occasion declined to grant a dispensation to a boy to hold a prebend in the cathedral of York. The Earl of Leicester, for a consideration, undertook the cause of the applicant, and was violently indignant when the archbishop persisted in his refusal. Leicester tried to exasperate the queen against the primate; of whom he asserted, that although he refused dispensation to the *protégé* of Leicester, on the ground that to do so would be the violation of a principle, yet, in spite of this pretended principle, he had, on other occasions, and to another party, made the concession. It was declared, that dispensations had been granted, on six several occasions, to mere children, to hold stalls; but, to make manifest his injustice and partiality, it was added that these were the children of bishops. Leicester moved the Privy Council, that an inquiry should be instituted as to the truth of these allegations.

It would seem, that the archbishop, when the charge was made, found it difficult at first to provide an answer, without admitting the existence, on his part, of culpable negligence. Applications for dispensations were of frequent occurrence in the Court of Faculties. They were granted, some of them, as a matter of course; and among the faults of Parker, for which he has been made to pay by the censures he subsequently received, this was one,

that he too often took for granted the correctness of what was done by his subordinates; and would endorse their statements, or countersign their orders, without sufficiently examining the documents submitted to his inspection. It was possible, that for dispensations, such as those complained of, applications had been made, and carelessly granted; his special attention being only occasionally directed to a case such as that which had now come before him.

CHAP.  
XIV.

Matthew  
Parker.

1559-75.

As we have no wish to defend the conduct of Parker, —whose conduct when inconsistent with his principles should be subjected to notice and reprobation, we have stated, what, judging from the faults of his character, and the practice of the court, might have easily occurred; but, as a matter of fact, it would appear, that the charge brought against him was not substantiated. He did immediately what he was required to do: he forwarded to the Privy Council the official record of all the dispensations which had been granted; and as no improper dispensation was detected, we must conclude that none such had been made; and we are the more persuaded of this, when we find that Leicester forgot his own dignity so far as, in an anonymous letter, to vituperate the primate, and to descend to threats.

Matthew Parker himself adopted the wise as well as the dignified part. His attention having been called to the palpable abuses of the Court of Faculties, he issued certain orders for the better regulation of the court; the 11th of which runs thus: that “without express assent of the archbishop, no dispensation shall pass *pro minore* under eighteen years at the least, with the certificate of his age.”

Although on account of his conscious inability as a lawyer, Parker, when sitting as a judge, did, on some

Parker's  
firmness of  
character.



CHAP.  
XIV.Matthew  
Parker.

1559-75.

Case of  
bigamy.

occasions, exhibit indecision of character; yet when he was fully persuaded of the merits of a case, he evinced considerable resolution and firmness. He certainly was not to be intimidated by the great; neither would he act contrary to the decisions of an honest conscience to please a friend. We have an instance of this in the case of one Stowel, whom he condemned for bigamy, although the culprit had secured the good offices in his favour, not only of Leicester, but also of Burghley.

To the judgment of the archbishop, Lord Burghley yielded with a good grace; while the angry passions of Leicester led him to the adoption of language, unjustifiable and coarse if addressed to anyone, but peculiarly offensive when the object of his attack was the primate of the Church.

Singular  
case.

In a letter to Burghley, bearing date August 11, 1561, a passage occurs which is interesting from its singularity. After alluding to the conference between Papists and Protestants about to be held at Poissy in the following August or September, Parker introduces the following passage: "The examination of yonder lady of Lincoln is returned, whereof I think ye have heard. In mine opinion—but that honour is marvellously exalted, it were honourable to God, she were chastised in Bridewell for example; and if my Lord hath given her frailty any just occasion of forgetting her duty, he were well worthy to be thoroughly chidden for his correction of the Council." \*

\* There was at that time no Earl of Lincoln. Henry Brandon, son of Charles Duke of Suffolk, by Mary, sister of Henry VIII., was created Earl of Lincoln the 18th of June, 1525, and died about the year 1545, when the title became extinct. Edward de Clinton, thirteenth Baron Clinton, was created Earl of Lincoln on the 4th of May, 1572, and died in 1584.—*Sir Harris Nicolas*, p. 229. See also *Calendar of State Papers*, Eliz. p. 183. *Parker's Correspondence*, p. 147.

It was at an early period of Parker's history that he sat in judgment on the case of Lady Katharine Grey; he pronounced sentence on May 12, 1562. Although Parker acted only as the member of a commission and with the concurrence of the other commissioners, his conduct, on this occasion, has been subjected to such severe remarks, that it becomes necessary to enter upon the case somewhat in detail. In the Burghley State Papers, almost the only reference to Parker has relation to this subject. At the beginning of Queen Elizabeth's reign the Lady Katharine Grey, sister to the unfortunate Lady Jane, had been appointed one of the maids of honour.

CHAP.  
XIV.

Matthew  
Parker.

1559-75.

Case of  
Lady  
Katharine  
Grey.

Although Queen Elizabeth never hesitated to adopt the severest, and even sometimes the most cruel, measures to effect her purposes, she, like the other members of her family, was generally willing to ascertain first, whether her purposes could not be carried by milder proceedings and in a conciliatory temper. By preferring the Lady Katharine to a place near her royal person, she thought she might have her eye upon her, and thus be able to nip in their bud any ambitious designs that she might be induced to entertain. After what happened in her sister's case, we are not surprised to find, that Elizabeth considered some precautions necessary. By the will of Henry VIII., the posterity of Margaret Queen of Scotland had been excluded from an inheritance to the crown of England; and this will was based upon or had been supported by certain Acts of Parliament. The right to the crown of England, under these circumstances, was generally considered to have devolved on the house of Suffolk. To this decision Elizabeth was opposed. She evidently considered that, in order to avoid a disputed succession, it was a point of sound policy to admit the hereditary right

CHAP.  
XIV.Matthew  
Parker.  
1559-75.

of the descendants of Queen Margaret. It is easy, at the same time, to understand why she abstained from asserting this. She well knew that the admission of the claim to the throne advanced by a Roman Catholic princess, would have roused the Puritans to arms. They, indeed, never ceased to clamour for the blood of Mary, when she had been compelled to place herself in the hands of the English government.

Elizabeth, under the given circumstances, thought much, no doubt, of her magnanimity in making the sister of the Lady Jane Grey an inmate of her house; and from the letters of the Lady Katharine, still in existence, we may see, that she, evidently a frivolous person, felt more deeply the calamity of an exile from the court, than she did the lenient restraint to which she was subjected, when regarded as a prisoner of state. When the queen heard that scandal was likely to be brought on her court, and that the Lady Katharine was expected soon to give birth to a child, of which the Earl of Hertford was the reputed father, her indignation and anger knew no bounds. In vain did the Lady Katharine and the Earl of Hertford declare, that they had been lawfully married; in vain did the earl's sister, the Lady Jane Seymour, affirm that she had accompanied the Lady Katharine from the queen's palace to the Earl of Hertford's house in Canon Row, where she secured the services of a priest, who united the lovers in bonds of matrimony; the queen would not believe them. This important fact required proof, and, for some reason or other, it was not forthcoming. The queen expressly stated, in a letter to Sir Edward Warner, Lieutenant of the Tower, that she was determined to appoint a commission, "to inquire and judge of the infamous conversation and pretended

marriage betwixt the Lady Katharine Grey and the Earl of Hertford." \*

CHAP.  
XIV.

Matthew  
Parker.

1559-75.

On August 12, 1561, Cecil wrote to Parker on the subject. On the 17th, the queen herself wrote to Sir Edward Warner, desiring him to examine the Lady Katharine very straitly. The queen affirmed, that many among the courtiers were aware of the attachment that had long existed between Lady Katharine and the Earl of Hertford: she required Warner to insist on her giving the name of her confidants, stating that she would have no favour shown to her, unless, in this respect, she complied. The queen evidently suspected, that there was some political movement connected with this affair, for she added: "It is certain there hath been great practices and purposes, and since the death of the Lady Jane, she hath been most privy." † To Mrs. Saintlow, a relation of Alderman Lodge, it was suspected that certain state secrets had been confided by the Lady Katharine; Warner was therefore to send for her; and, it is added: "Ye shall put her in awe of divers matters, confessed by the Lady Katharine, and so deal with her, that she may confess to you all her knowledge in the same matters." The next letter in the Burghley Papers, ‡ is dated February 10, 1562, and it refers to the commission at which the Most Reverend Father in God the Archbishop of Canterbury was at the head. The other commissioners were the Bishop of London, Grindal, and Sir William Petrie. From this letter we have already made a quotation to show that the object of inquiry was to ascertain the fact, whether the parties were legally married. The question was one of more importance than at first sight appears; for Jewel in a letter to Peter

\* Burghley Papers, p. 378.

† Ibid. p. 369.

‡ Ibid. p. 378.



CHAP.  
XIV.Matthew  
Parker.

1559-75.

Judgment  
given by  
the com-  
missioners  
against  
Lady  
Katharine  
and the  
Earl.Imprison-  
ment of  
Lady  
Katharine  
and the  
Earl.Their  
apartments  
in the  
Tower.

Martyr observes: "If this marriage is a legal one, the son now born will be brought up in the hope of succeeding to the crown."

This was the Puritan view of the subject, and the queen knew it.\*

On May 12, 1562, the commissioners gave judgment against Lady Katharine and the earl; and the archbishop pronounced a public censure on their conduct.

The imprisonment of Lady Katharine and of the Earl of Hertford was continued; and it is frequently mentioned in the Calendar of State Papers. Their names are included in a list of the prisoners in the Tower on September 5, 1562. On February 10, 1563, Lady Hertford had another son; and Machyn in his Diary says, "The god-fathers were two warders of the Tower, and his name was called Thomas."†

It will be seen from this statement, that the confinement was not very strict; and although the state prisoners were not to go beyond the precincts of the Tower, those precincts were extensive. Lady Katharine was, during a part of this period, lodged within the Tower itself; but she was permitted to receive the visits of her friends. Being of royal birth, she was treated with the respect due to her rank, so far as this was consistent with her safe custody. We happen still to possess a list of the furniture provided by the government for her convenience: it consisted of five pieces of tapestry to hang the chamber; three window pieces of the like stuff; a sparver for the bed of changeable silk damask; a silk quilt of red striped gold; a bed and bolster of down, with two pillows of down; one white linen quilt stuffed

\* Zurich Letters, p. 103.

† Machyn's Diary, p. 300. Machyn, p. 268, says that the eldest son was baptized in the Tower, 5th of September, 1561.

with wool; four pair of fustians, the one of six breadth and the others of five; two carpets of Turkey making, one small window carpet; one chair of cloth of gold raised with crimson velvet, with two pounds of copper gilt, and the queen's arms on the back; one cushion of purple velvet; two footstools covered with green velvet; one cupboard joined; and one bed, one bolster, and a counterpane for the woman.

CHAP.  
XIV.  
Matthew  
Parker.  
1559-75.

It is true that Sir Edward Warner depreciated the furniture as old and dilapidated; but then we must remember, that he would claim the furniture as his perquisite on the release of the prisoner; and while he would complain, if the best of all things were not provided, the government, knowing that it was doubtful how long a prisoner would remain in his custody, would desire to be put to as little expense as possible. The dignity, not the comfort, of the prisoner was consulted. It must be added, that in a letter to Sir William Cecil in September, 1563, Sir Edward Warner unintentionally exonerates the government from blame, since he attributes the injury done to the furniture to the gambols of the Lady Katharine's monkeys and dogs.\*

It is important to note these circumstances, because if the treatment of state prisoners was less severe than is generally supposed, we can understand why the queen felt no compunction when she ordered her courtiers, on falling under her displeasure, to an imprisonment which sometimes amounted to little more than the custody of a friend. It will acquit also the commissioners of any charge of undue severity, when the object in committing state prisoners to confinement was merely to prevent their egress from the country; and, being under strict surveillance, from entering into conspiracies with mal-

\* Ellis, second series, ii. 274.

CHAP.  
XIV.

Matthew  
Parker.

1559-75.

contents against the government. The Earl of Hertford must have felt more deeply the heavy fines that were laid upon him, which were arbitrarily imposed for the benefit of the exchequer; and for which no excuse can be made, unless the avarice of the queen was considered sufficient to justify her in robbing a subject.

Committed  
to the  
custody of  
her uncle.

So much care was taken of Lady Katharine, that when the plague broke out in 1563, she was immediately sent to the house of her uncle, Lord John Grey, at Pyrgo in Essex. According to the custom of the time, she was regarded as his prisoner, and he was responsible for her safe keeping.

From this time until her death, there is a series of interesting letters from the Lady Katharine, which may be seen in the second series published by Sir Henry Ellis. In those letters the writer reiterates the expression of her misery at being excluded from the court of Elizabeth; but she does not complain of any undue hardship as exhibited towards her person. The queen was inexorable. Sir Henry Ellis is of opinion, that this was partly due to a book written at this time, by John Hales, in defence of the succession of the line represented by the Lady Katharine as opposed to the claims of Mary Queen of Scots.\*

Her death.

In 1565, the Lady Katharine and her husband were recommitted to the Tower; she was afterwards under the charge of a more vigilant keeper, Sir Owen Hopton, who succeeded Sir John Wentworth on October 2, 1567. The queen directed him to take into his charge the Lady

\* This appears to have been answered by "Allegations in behalf of the High and Mighty Princess the Lady Mary, now Queen of Scots, against the opinions and book set forth in part and favour of the Lady Katharine and the rest of the issues of the French Queen touching the succession to the Crown." See Calendar of State Papers, p. 286.

Katharine Grey, but to keep her from the access of all strangers.\* Her health failing her, she was permitted, occasionally, for the sake of change of air, to be removed to Yoxford in Suffolk. According to Sir Owen Hopton, she died on January 27, in the tenth year of Queen Elizabeth. †

CHAP.  
XIV.  
Matthew  
Parker.  
1559-75.

We have entered into this case in some detail, because Parker has been exposed to some censure for his conduct on this occasion. But Parker was not the sole judge; and when the case is fairly and impartially considered, it is scarcely possible, that any sentence except that which was given could have been pronounced. The question was, whether the parties were married. It is useless to say, that from evidence afterwards produced, they certainly were married; the question before the court was, whether any proof of the fact could be at that time produced; and in the absence of proof, under very suspicious circumstances, judgment could not have been other than it was.

Parker  
blamed.

For some reason or other, no proof was forthcoming; and in the absence of proof, the commissioners were obliged to declare that the assertion made by the Earl of Hertford and the Lady Katharine was not to be credited. Sir Henry Ellis observes, that the marriage of the Lady Katharine and the Earl of Hertford was not established till 1606. The priest who joined them having come forward, and other circumstances agreeing, a common law jury at that time found it a good marriage. Why the priest was not produced in Parker's time we cannot say; the blame rests with those who prevented his appearance: but Parker was not one of these; nor do we see any reason why he should have taken part

\* Calendar of State Papers, p. 301.

† Ibid. p. 305.



CHAP.  
XIV.

Matthew  
Parker.

1559-75.

Lady Mary  
Grey.

against the young couple. It is probable that the priest, fearing the consequences of his appearance, secreted himself.

In the Calendar of State Papers there are many references also to the marriage of the Lady Mary Grey \* with Thomas Keyes, the sergeant porter, at which Elizabeth was justly displeased. Mention is made in the Calendar, of a letter from Keyes to the archbishop, praying, that he will be a mean to the queen for mercy: this letter Parker enclosed to Burghley, stating that Keyes had solicited redress at his hands, in virtue of his pastoral office.

The death of Keyes is referred to soon afterwards.†

In the year 1563, Parker had to decide another matrimonial case. The circumstances were these: Parker's great friend Sir William Cecil had a cousin named Barnaby Googe, who was at that time about twenty-three years of age; having been a retainer of Cecil's, Barnaby Googe was now appointed a gentleman pensioner of Queen Elizabeth. He was a gentleman and a scholar, and about that time he published a collection of eclogues, having previously, in the year 1560, at the age of twenty, translated "The First Three Books of the Zodiacks of Life" by Palingenius.‡ Barnaby had made an engagement of marriage with Mary the daughter of Mr. Darrel of Kent. This engagement was clandestine, or, at all events, not known to her parents. Their desire was, that she should be married to a certain rich man, Sampson Leonard, a prothonotary then resident at

\* This lady was for some years in the custody of Sir Thomas Gresham. An account of her, at some length, occurs in Burgon's "Life of Gresham" in reference to Mayfield, where he then resided.

† Calendar of State Papers, p. 377.

‡ Brydges' Cens. Lit. ii. 212.

Chevening. To this match the young lady expressed her dislike, and to render it illegal she alleged a precontract with Googe. Strange as we should think it in these days, Cecil, in behalf of his kinsman, wrote to the archbishop, who was to act as judge in the case; but it is proper to state, that he only desired that the matter should be heard according to law and equity. But to write the letter was a work of supererogation, or else it was an imputation cast upon the judge's character; for if he did not decide according to law and equity, he would have been a corrupt magistrate. The archbishop, in a letter to Cecil, dated November 20, 1563,\* observes:—"This matter I have examined advisedly, having not only the young gentlewoman before me, to understand of herself the state of the cause, who remaineth firm and stable to stand by that contract she hath made, as also her father and mother, whom I find the most earnest parents against the bargain as I ever saw. In fine, I have sequestered her out of both their hands into the custody of one Mr. Tufton, a right honest gentleman, until the precontract, which is by her parents alleged for one Leonard's son, a prothonotary, be induced; but they may bring it into the Arches to spend money: howbeit, I mean to dull that expectation and to go *plane et summarie* to work, to spare expenses which rich Leonard and the wilful parents would fain enter to weary the young gentleman, peradventure not superfluously monied so to sail the seas with them."

CHAP.  
XIV.

Matthew  
Parker.

1559-75.

Cecil's  
inter-  
ference.

Parker was considered by some persons to have expressed an approval of a precontract in respect to marriage made by children without the consent of their parents. Such an inference, however, cannot fairly be deduced from the judgment, his object being merely to

Parker's  
conduct  
vindicated.

\* Corresp. p. 198.

CHAP.  
XIV.Matthew  
Parker.

1559-75.

Reform of  
the Court  
of Arches.

deliver a young woman from the unhappiness that would result from a forced marriage and a union without affection. He acted as a judge in equity.

The mention which is made in the letter just referred to, on the probability of the suit being carried into the Court of Arches, leads to the consideration of certain circumstances connected with that court in which Parker was concerned. Of the Court of Arches, the principal of the archiepiscopal courts of Canterbury, we have had occasion frequently to speak. Here, where the primates generally ended their career as chancellors, or judges, or leading statesmen, we have seen them commence their legal practice. This court exercised, and still exercises, the appellate jurisdiction from each of the diocesan and most of the peculiar courts within the province. Like the other ecclesiastical courts it needed reform, and in the year 1573, the archbishop issued certain statutes and constitutions for its regulation. These constitutions were published at Lambeth on May 6.

Case of Dr.  
Clarke.

It was with reference to this court that Parker was involved in one of his most perplexing controversies with Leicester and the queen. In this controversy we have an instance of Parker's pertinacity, determination, and firmness in defending a cause which he felt to be just and right. He had appointed as his official in the Court of Arches Dr. Bartholomew Clarke, whose predecessor had been Dr. Weston. Dr. Clarke was a Cambridge man, and a scholar of high repute. In speaking of this preferment, the archbishop mentions it as a first reward "for all his study and learning in which he hath now spent the course and travail of his life by the space of these twenty years past; and having also refused (as he telleth me) in Angiers the stipend of three hundred

crowns yearly to be a public reader there.”\* It should be observed, that “the archbishop had granted Clarke the place by patent, while Dr. Weston, who was Dean of the Arches before, was alive, and after his death he had his promise of a new patent during life.” It was therefore peculiarly hard that he should be deprived of it, a step on which Leicester had apparently set his heart, as Strype supposes, “because probably he had been impartial, and decided something against one of Leicester’s creatures.”

CHAP.  
XIV.  
Matthew  
Parker.  
1559-75.

In this matter, the queen acted in an exceedingly arbitrary manner. Wrought upon probably by Leicester (whom Parker was careful not to introduce in his correspondence with Elizabeth), in June, 1573, the queen wrote† to the archbishop summarily to remove Dr. Clarke, on pretence that he was too young for the place.

To this the archbishop returned the following cautious reply:—

“Pleaseth it your most excellent Majesty. Since my return home to Lambeth, I willed Dr. Clerk to remove him from the room of the deanery of the Arches. He immediately said, that he had as lief forego his life, for thereby he should be utterly undone, as now neither able to procure, being so discredited, &c. This morning he came again to me with the same intent. Then I told him it was your Majesty’s pleasure he should depart. He answered with all submission, that he trusted to your clemency and justice, that he might have your favour with the right of the law; and said, moreover, that *Dr. Yale and Dr. Weston were as young as himself was, when they were preferred*, and that he is of thirty-six or thirty-seven in years, and had spent all his life in study.”‡

June 15,  
1573.

\* Corresp. p. 431.

† Ibid.

‡ Ibid. p. 428



CHAP.  
XIV.Matthew  
Parker.

1559-75.

This letter Parker took care should be presented to the queen by the lord treasurer's hand, "which was some advantage to his cause." Clarke also sent a paper to Parker, containing several arguments in his own favour, and persuaded Lord Burghley to use his influence with the queen in his behalf.

But the queen continued persistent, that Clarke should resign. On the 19th of the same month, the archbishop had Clarke with him at Lambeth, and having thoroughly examined all that could be said in the matter, wrote a long and most carefully considered letter to the queen. In this he dwells on the fact that this deprivation would be ruin to Dr. Clarke, "who might never more show his face, not only in the Arches, where his only profession and whole means of living consisteth, but also must likewise banish himself even from all other places and company of credit." He mentions Dr. Clarke's hope, that he may at least be treated according to the law, and have justice done him; and that as regards his ability, he was willing that it should be put to the test as the queen might appoint. Parker then urges "the last labour of his against Saunders," \* "Wherein," says the archbishop, "I must need witness with him that surely he showed himself a most dutiful and careful subject towards your Highness, and though he acknowledgeth that, whatsoever he hath done, shall do, or can do, is but the least part of his bounden duty towards your Majesty, yet he hopeth,

\* It was partly on account of Dr. Clarke's work against Saunders that the archbishop had made him Dean of the Arches. It is not quite clear whether he or Ackworth wrote "*De Visibili Romæ Anarchia*," which will be afterwards referred to in connection with the queen's visit to Parker at Canterbury, when the archbishop presented a copy of that work to all the noblemen there. The fact, however, sufficiently shows the importance he attached to circulating a refutation of Saunders's book. The circumstance is mentioned in *Matthæus*.

that of your grace you will please to accept the same as a mean, so naturally to conserve him in your Majesty's favour, so that he may never be pronounced by your Majesty unworthy of that whereof the Archbishop of Canterbury and also the laws of the realm both have and do allow him as worthy and capable."

CHAP.  
XIV.  
Matthew  
Parker.  
1559-75.

He proceeds to back Dr. Clarke's suit in the strongest manner, by showing that his deprivation would cast disparagement on the archbishop himself, as not being allowed to choose his own officers, "a thing that in the meanest bishop that is, was never impugned." He defends his right and the dignity of his see with much spirit; and concludes by asking the queen, in case of her continuing to insist on Dr. Clarke's removal, to make some one else the instrument of it, and not to levy on him "so heavy a burden," as the doing an act so opposed to his conscience, as that of removing one as unworthy, whom he verily thought to be worthy; and thus concludes in words of covert but sharp rebuke:—"And so most humbly I take my leave of your Highness: wishing in my prayer to Almighty God your long and prosperous reign over England, *and that the great grace wherewith Almighty God hath blessed you, with the goodness of your own nature, be not drawn to other men's several affections.* From Lambeth, this 19th of June.

"Your Highness' most bounden  
and obedient chaplain,  
"MATTHUE CANTUAR.

"To my sovereign good lady the Queen's  
most excellent Majesty."

The result of the spirited and decided proceedings was, that the queen for a while left the matter in abeyance. Dr. Clarke continued to act in his capacity; and in De-

CHAP.  
XIV.Matthew  
Parker.

1559-75.

ember of the same year, by a commission from the archbishop, he held a visitation at Canterbury.

This interim of six months had not, however, altered the queen's desire to have Dr. Clarke displaced ; or she was instigated afresh to urge his dismissal from office ; but Dr. Clarke, through the primate, had an influential friend in the lord treasurer, through whose interference he escaped the machinations of those enemies who poisoned the queen's mind against him. During Parker's lifetime he certainly retained his office ; and although there is reason to suppose, that he was, subsequently, for a time, deprived of it, yet so long after as the year 1588, after Leicester's death, a letter to him from Lord Chancellor Hatton bore the address, "To Mr. Doctor Clarke, Dean of the Arches."

Parker's feelings of attachment to the queen were similar to those of a parent to his child. He never could banish from his mind his last interview with the unfortunate Queen Anne, and her solemn appeal to him to be the friend and protector of her infant. He felt, that his friendship for the queen was not only greater in *degree* than that which could exist in any of her other friends, it was superior in *kind*. He expected in all her difficulties that she would consult him, that she would like to have him always near her person, and that she would have such confidence in him, that in the bestowal of her patronage he would always be consulted. He deeply felt the occasional neglect which he experienced, rather from that thoughtlessness on the part of the queen, which an ordinary friend would hardly have noticed, but which was noticed by Parker, because it betokened an absence of that character of friendship on her part which was so deeply impressed on his heart ; and which, having regard to the difference in their respective stations, he had, per-

haps, no right to expect. In his letters to Cecil he mentioned, that he wished well to her majesty, not only because she was his prince, but for the manner in which by her mother she had been confided to his care; and he complained deeply, that when he had occasion to make suit to her majesty, and to ask for preferment or patronage, in behalf of those whom he thought thus to requite for service done either to himself or to the public, he was treated as an ordinary suitor: what he sought being often granted to others whose claim to her notice was not to be compared to his. He even remarked to the lord treasurer, that his influence at court was less than that enjoyed by any of his predecessors, and that the treatment he received was sometimes actually unkind. Writing in 1572, he told the lord treasurer, that for the preceding twelve years he had scarcely asked any favours of the queen, and that he had seldom obtained what other sovereigns were in the habit of granting freely to their primates.

That there was some ground for these complaints there can be no doubt; but that they were exaggerated is equally clear from the facts to which we shall hereafter refer, when we shall have to speak of the friendly visits which the queen made to the primate, and the favours of a personal nature which were offered to him unasked.

The lord treasurer had privately communicated to Parker his opinion, that Leicester, whom he describes as "furious in his anger and hostility," had determined either to make the primate "truckle to him, or else to ruin him." Parker replied, that for his hostility he did not care; but that he would continue to treat him with the respect due to the ministers of the queen, or anyone else whom she was pleased to honour.

CHAP.  
XIV.

Matthew  
Parker.

1559-75.



CHAP.  
XIV.

Matthew  
Parker.  
1559-75.

Parker, however, a true friend, mourned over the indiscretion of the queen, when, by her reckless conduct towards Leicester, she subjected herself to the ribaldry of the idle, and cast a shade upon her character which is not even yet removed. That she was guilty only of indiscretions, Parker was fully convinced. As we have before remarked, the more serious of the charges brought against her were of a foreign growth, originating in polemical malignity or in official wit. She suspected no wrong, and did not suppose that any could be thought of her. "*Honi soit qui mal y pense.*" But the indignation of the queen's friends was aroused by the selfish vanity of Leicester. He cared not to sacrifice the queen, if by so doing he could subserve his own purposes. He wished to blazon their intimacy, and to make it appear that the intimacy must end in a marriage. Repeatedly the queen detected his purposes, and discarded him, though after a brief disgrace she restored him to favour.

After her return from her Progress in November, 1574, she took up her abode for a short time in Leicester's house. This provoked observation, as his house was near the queen's own residence at Hampton Court.

The impropriety of such conduct struck Parker very forcibly. The queen would no longer offer opportunity to her old friend to proffer advice. What, therefore, he could not do by word of mouth, he did by his conduct. It was customary for the primate, as it was his duty, to pay his respects to the queen on her return home from a Progress. But, while she was on a visit to the earl, he did not approach her; he waited till the end of the week, when she and her suite were settled at Hampton Court.

Parker's conduct was the more marked, because when the queen visited the archbishop at Canterbury, the

primate made no distinction between the queen's ministers; the lord treasurer was his guest, as was Hatton, the master of the horse, and also the Earl of Leicester. Other instances might be adduced of his forgiving and forbearing temper, when the insults offered by Lord Leicester were of a personal nature, affording no detriment to the public. Parker was, through shyness, unable to express himself with ease; and in society, he was thought to be abrupt in his manners; but for the soundness of his judgment and for his strict integrity he was universally respected, while for the benevolence of his disposition he was beloved by his friends.

CHAP.  
XIV.

Matthew  
Parker.

1559-75.

We may conclude this chapter by a reference to the history of Bornelius,—a history which may convince us that, although Parker may not have been acquainted with the technicalities of the legal profession, the character of his mind was judicial; and by a sound judgment he could avert the difficulties which filled the courts with suitors and provided the lawyers with clients. A lingering credulity followed hard upon the ages of superstition; and with respect to astrologers, witches, and magicians, this credulity prevailed in high places during the reign of Elizabeth, and long after. Everyone is aware of its development in the time of James I., and the deceptions and cruelties of the notorious Hopkins. The archbishop resolutely discountenanced such pretenders, and a curious example of this occurred about this time, when he imprisoned in the King's Bench one Dr. Bornelius. Bornelius was a foreign physician of some repute, pretending to much skill in art, magic, and astrology, as well as in physic. The people resorted to him in great numbers, to be cured of their sicknesses, and they had a wonderful confidence in him and his

CHAP.  
XIV.Matthew  
Parker.

1559-75.

magic.\* Strype supposes this man to have been "the son of Henricus Bornelius, a preacher of God's word at Wesel," and that he wrote a copy of verses printed before Bale's Centuries. Be this as it may, it appears from the State Papers of this period, now open to our inspection, that the name of the person before us was Dr. Eliseus Bornelius, who, two years previously, wrote to Cecil mentioning his care of, and his attendance upon, Robert Wingfield; stating, moreover, that at that time he had expended, while residing in London, more than 100*l.*, while he had only received 12*l.* He desires Cecil to use some good means for his better remuneration.† This letter shows that Bornelius had been carrying on his pretended arts in London, some time before Parker had taken judicial proceedings against him. At what time the archbishop had first committed him to custody does not appear; but a little before Easter, 1570, Parker permitted him to be a prisoner at large; although he charged the keeper to take precautions against his practising upon the queen's subjects. In the beginning of April, Parker intended to take a bond of Bornelius, that he would depart the realm. Ultimately it would seem that Bornelius settled in Russia.‡ Previously, on April 3, Bornelius sent his wife to the archbishop with a letter, in which he asked for a personal interview. In it he prognosticates great impending changes in England; and signs himself

\* Cecil appears to have been inclined to believe in him. See Calendar of State Papers, p. 219. Letter of Dr. John Dee, who studied occult sciences, and had published a book called the "Stezanographia;" also, p. 309,—a licence to Hallye and Cornelius de Hooghe to exercise occult sciences, from which great advantage will arise to the queen and her dominions.

† Calendar of State Papers, p. 308. The index gives two other references to him which I cannot verify.

‡ Corresp. p. 364, note,

Medicus Physicus.\* The archbishop, however, gave some token of the existence in himself of the superstitions he censured in others, for he “declined to have this man before him *alone*.” On the same day he wrote to Cecil, proposing to have him examined before the Council. Parker’s letter† proves that he entertained strong suspicions that Bornelius was a dangerous impostor: he mentions, that treachery had been used against the archbishop himself, for certain holes had been bored in the bottom of his state barge, in order that it might sink when filled by the archbishop and his attendants. Plots, it was reported, were rife in the country. As regards Bornelius, he concludes: “What he hath to utter ye may learn; ‘Sub omni lapide scorpio latet.’ . . . I am thus bold, peradventure more suspicious than I need. But I refer all to your wisdom.” Bornelius wrote on the 7th to Cecil, but making a mistake in his chronology, his astrology was brought into disrepute. A free departure was, at length, sought for by him to Russia, and he promised, in return, to communicate the manners and tempers of the Muscovites, and many particulars concerning their country. Thus the archbishop appears to have been happily rid of him, and to have saved Lord Burghley and the queen’s council from trouble.

CHAP.  
XIV.

Matthew  
Parker.

1559-75.

\* The letter, in Latin, may be found in Strype’s Appendix, iii. 177.

† Corresp. p. 364.



## CHAPTER XV.

## PARKER'S LITERARY PURSUITS.

Version of the Psalms.—On celibacy of the clergy.—Excerpta from Martin's book.—Parker obtains an order of the Privy Council to borrow books.—Number of books collected.—Matthias Flacius, surnamed Illyricus.—Elfric's Anglo-Saxon Homily.—Gildas.—John Josceline.—Bale, the precursor of the Master of the Rolls.—The Chronicles.—Flores Historiarum.—Matthew Paris.—Walsingham's *Historia Anglicana* and *Hypodigma Neustriæ*.—Asser's *Life of Alfred*.—Parker as an editor.—*De Antiquitate Britannicæ Ecclesiæ*.—Parker's bequest to Corpus Christi College, Cambridge.—List of his works.

CHAP.  
XV.

Matthew  
Parker.  
1559-75.

DURING two periods of his life, Parker seems to have especially devoted himself to literary labours—in the reign of Queen Mary, and in the later years of his episcopate. He was an author, a translator, a most zealous collector of ancient manuscripts, and among the editors of our ancient chronicles, he claims, at least in point of time, the foremost place.

Of his version of the Psalms mention has been made incidentally in a preceding chapter; and of this work there is nothing more to be said. We have also alluded to his publication "*On the Lawfulness of Clerical Marriages*."\* Of this work, which was first published in Queen

\* On this work there are some useful remarks in Lowndes' Catalogue. It is entitled "*A Defence of Priests' Marriages, stablyshed by the Imperial Lawes of the Realme of England, against a Civilian naming*

Mary's reign, he was the editor rather than the author, although he enlarged it by several valuable additions, for which he was alone accountable. It was written in English, and the author proved the lawfulness of clerical marriages by reference both to the Divine law and to the laws of this kingdom. It was reprinted in 1561, anonymously; but with the permission and at the expense of the archbishop, and was evidently designed to enlighten the royal mind, at a time when Elizabeth was threatening to put the laws in force which compelled the celibacy of the clergy. From Parker's preface we learn, that a book written by Martin, to prove the unlawfulness of priests' marriages, having fallen into his hands, he published in reply this treatise. He conjectured it to have been written by Sir Richard Morrison, if the author were a layman, or, if he were a clergyman, by Ponet, late Bishop of Winchester. He gives no authority, however, for either of these conclusions. The work contains an account of the marriage of priests from before the Norman Conquest, and brings it down to the reign of Edward VI. To all is added an index, which is wanting in the common books.\* Strype says, that because this is a

CHAP.  
XV.

Matthew  
Parker.  
1559-75.

himselfe Thomas Martin, Doctor of the Civil Lawes, going about to disprove the said marriages lawfull by the eternall Word of God. Imprinted by Richard Jugge." It would appear to have been dedicated to Philip and Mary. With reference to this treatise, Archbishop Parker says, "That the work is put forth from a certayne writing being in his custodie, gathered together and written in the Reign of King Philip and Queene Marie, which sayde booke was written by a learned man of that time, who shortly after dyed." It may be noted, that Ponet died at Strasburg, April 11, 1556, *i.e.* during Mary's reign.

\* In Nasmith's Catalogue, p. 416, is the following title of a work which had been in Parker's possession, and which he probably used at this time:—"A Certain Case extracte out of ancient law of Hoel da Kyng of Wales, in the yere of our Lorde nyne hundred and fourtene

CHAP.  
XV.

Matthew  
Parker.

1559-75.

Excerpta  
from  
Martin's  
book.

book out of common hands, he has preserved a few *excerpta*, which he gives at length; the most remarkable being a reply in the form of a narrative to the Malthusian argument of Martin, that by allowing the marriage of priests, the nation would have such a vast increase of souls, that there would not be food sufficient to feed them, but create a famine. Parker ridicules the idea, and, in so doing, gives an account of a controversial conversation between the Earl of Shrewsbury and the French ambassador; the noble earl affirming, that *if we should not eat our beasts and make victuals of them as fast as we do, they would so increase beyond measure, that they would make victuals of us and eat us up. Such was the productiveness of our land.*

In this publication, Parker recommends the perusal of two works—"De Potestate Regia et Ecclesiastica," and the "Institution of a Christian Man"—as suited for the exigencies of the time. Masters seems to speak of Parker as the author also of another tract—"Non debere res Ecclesiasticas, ad publicum Sacri Ministerii usum destinatas, ad alios usus transferri." \*

After he had become Archbishop of Canterbury, Parker, availing himself of the advantages he possessed as primate, and pursuing his antiquarian tastes, became "a mighty collector of books." In addition to obtaining them by purchase, he procured a printed order of the Privy Council, to borrow (himself, or by his deputies) all the ancient records and monuments belonging to the dissolved monasteries that were in the hands of private persons. Whatever may be Parker's errors as an editor, his most

passed, whereby it may be gathered that Priests had lawfully married wyves at that tyme." In membranis sicut XIV. script. This was imprinted at London in 1550.

\* Hist. of Corpus Christi College, Cambridge, p. 91.

valuable collection of our English chronicles in the library of Corpus Christi College, Cambridge, still exists to show that he thus rendered an inestimable benefit to the cause of English history. To preserve from destruction these ancient monuments of learning, he employed a considerable number of men to make search through England and Wales (and perhaps Scotland and Ireland also) for books of all sorts and on all subjects, though especially historical. Mention is made, that one of his agents, named Batman, procured in four years not fewer than 6,700 volumes. Strype quotes the passage as given by Batman himself, but he does not give the title of the book; he only adds, as stated by Batman: "I was not the only man in the business, but also others did their good wills." \*

CHAP.  
XV.

Matthew  
Parker.

1559-75.

At the present time, when a movement is in progress to procure the removal of public documents, such as registers, &c., from private hands into some place accessible to literary men, it is curious to note, that in May, 1561,† Matthias Flacius (Francowitz), surnamed Illyricus, invited the attention of Parker to a similar scheme. He proposed, that all the manuscripts in these kingdoms, and such books as were considered rare, should be collected and deposited in some public place for their better preservation.‡ In all probability it was by this suggestion of Illyricus, that Parker was induced to procure that order of the Privy Council of which mention has just been made, and by the force of which he was empowered

\* Strype, ii. 497.

† Madden's *Matthew Paris*, preface, xxix.

‡ A catalogue of 482 manuscripts, given by Matthew Parker to the colleges of Corpus Christi and St. Mary the Virgin in the University of Cambridge, has been printed by T. Nasmith, giving the contents of each manuscript.



CHAP.  
XV.

Matthew  
Parker.  
1559-75.

to search for manuscripts, and thus to acquire what has been of service to recent investigators.

One of the earliest and most important of the works edited by Archbishop Parker was Elfric's "Anglo-Saxon Homily," which, from its treatment of the dogma of transubstantiation, has become well known to modern controversialists.\* A specimen of this has been given by Wright, who mentions it as the first edition of Elfric. It was entitled "A Testimonie of Antiquitie, shewing the auncient fayth in the Church of England touching the sacrament of the body and bloude of the Lorde," &c.; Elfric's Pastoral Sermon, Anglo-Saxon and English, with learned Preface, and authenticated by the names of "Matthewe Archbishop of Canterburye, Thomas Archbishop of Yorke, and many other prelates . . . said to have been published by Archbishop Parker himself in 1566."

Gildas.

Soon after this edition of Elfric, Gildas was published, and although the work is not valuable in itself, yet Parker was right in beginning his series of chronicles with the earliest British historian. Hardy says, in the year 1567,† John Josceline undertook a new edition of Gildas' "De Excidio Britanniaë," in which the alterations and omissions in Polydore Vergil's edition were supplied on MS. authority.‡

\* Biog. Brit. Lit. (Anglo-Saxon Period), p. 491. Quoted in vol. i. p. 443, of this work, "for the clear and explicit manner in which it makes known to us the doctrine of the Church of England in this age with reference to the Eucharist."

† There had been previous editions, which are mentioned in Lowndes' Catalogue, and in Wright's Biog. Brit. Lit. i. 134.

‡ One of these was a Cottonian MS., formerly marked Vitellius A. vi. (now destroyed—Hardy, p. 61), and the second is now in the public library at Cambridge, D. d. i. 17. See Hardy, p. 61.

The beginning of Josceline's preface shows, that it was through Parker's authority and interference that he had obtained the manuscripts he used. \*

CHAP.  
XV.

Matthew  
Parker.

1559-75.

*"To Matthew, Archbishop of Canterbury, Primate of all England, and his lord; the preface of John Josselin.*

Josceline's  
letter to  
Parker.

"Most learned lord, by the use of your authority, I have lately happened on two ancient codices of Gildas the Briton, one of which, from the strangeness of its letters, very different from our own, was evidently written more than six hundred years ago, and formerly belonged to the library of St. Augustine, at Canterbury; the other of much more recent date, and not as well written, but differing exceedingly little from the first, once belonged to the abbey of Glastonbury, and is now the sole property of a Kentish gentleman, a jurisconsult." He then proceeds to criticise the edition of Polydore, with which he has compared these manuscripts, and points out many of his inaccuracies and anachronisms.

Bale † is conjectured by most writers to have joined

\* The conclusion of the preface shows plainly that the work had been done by the order of Parker. "It remains to state, most excellent lord, that the whole may be referred to your acceptance, *since at your command I undertook this labour*, and since you both procured for me the ancient codices and the assistance by which I could the more easily compare them with one another, so that the labour has been the less troublesome. May Christ long preserve thee, both for thyself and his Church. Your studious client and servant, John Josselin."

† Sir F. Madden remarks, that Parker, "after the death of Bale, in 1563, contemplated the acquisition of the manuscripts of that indefatigable scholar, and wrote to secretary Cecil, that 'he was promised to have them for money;' but he does not appear to have succeeded in this design." In this, however, Sir F. Madden is wrong, for Parker, writing to Illyricus, mentions that a great heap—*ingens acervus*—of Bale's books had come into his possession; but they were not such as would be of use to Illyricus. Corresp. p. 287.

CHAP.  
XV.Matthew  
Parker.

1559-75.

Bale the  
precursor  
of the  
Master of  
the Rolls.

with Flacius Illyricus in urging Parker to edit the early English chronicles and histories. Sir F. Madden has some valuable observations on this subject. There was, he truly observes, in Bale the same spirit which animated those who have recently worked under the direction of the Master of the Rolls.\* “Let one noble man,” says Bale, “bring forth one noble author, and another imprint another. In like case, let one rich merchant bring one worthy work of an ancient writer to light, and another put forth another. Besides the *British* † authors mentioned before, let one bring forth Bede;” and then amongst other writers he mentions those afterwards edited by Parker, the *Flores Historiarum*, Matthew Paris, and Asser. “It seems then far from improbable that we owe to these noble sentiments of Bale the subsequent publications of the historians put forth by the care of Archbishop Parker.” And doubtless it was, that influenced by the praises bestowed by Bale on (the so-called) Matthew of Westminster, he began his publications with him.

The chronicles edited by Parker were these, put forth, I think, in this order:—

Matthew  
of West-  
minster.

The “*Flores Historiarum*,” in 1567, ‡ of which he issued a second edition in 1570, finding the first imperfect. Its full title is: “*Flores Historiarum, per Matthæum Westmonasteriensem collecti, præcipue de Rebus Britan-*

\* Mat. Paris, pref. xviii. It is impossible for any historical writer to refer to this series of publications, without expressing his deep sense of gratitude to Lord Romilly. Never was work more wisely devised, and seldom has the superintendent of a great work been more admirably supported by his collaborateurs.

† Perhaps this caused Parker to employ Josceline on Gildas.

‡ The identical copy of this first edition, which was presented by the archbishop to Queen Elizabeth, is now in the Cracherode collection. Lowndes.



nicis ab Exordio Mundi usque ad annum Domini 1307." Lond. 1570, fol.

CHAP.  
XV.

The "Historia Major of Matthew Paris." Folio, Lond. 1571. Printed by Reynold Wolfe.\*

Matthew  
Parker.  
1559-75.

Walsingham's "Historia Anglicana." Folio, Lond. 1574. Printed by Henry Binneman. Its title, according to Lowndes, was, "Historia brevis Thomæ Walsingham, ab Edwardo primo ad Henricum Quintum." †

Walsing-  
ham.

Walsingham's "Hypodigma Neustriæ." Folio, Lond. 1574. Printed by John Day; entitled "Ypodigma Neustriæ vel Normanniæ," per Thomam Walsingham, ab irruptione usque ad annum 8 Henrici quinti.

Asser's "Life of Alfred," "Alfredi Regis Res Gestæ." Folio, Lond. 1574 (the title-page does not give the name of the printer). ‡

Asser's  
Alfred.

Strype's account of these publications § must now be

\* "Monumenta Historica Britannica," prepared by H. Petrie, Esq., and rendered doubly valuable by being edited by Sir Thomas Duffus Hardy, i. 8.

† Under the art. Walsingham, in Lowndes, the exact titles of these three books are given. Together they now form one volume (very rare), but, being printed by different persons, and separately paged, they were without doubt edited separately.

‡ Kett's rebellion has been already described, and it is necessary here to mention but cursorily Neville's book "De Furoribus Norfolciensium, Ketto duce." It was written by Parker's direction, and for it he paid one hundred pounds. Corresp. p. xiii. It was printed by Binneman in 1575.

§ Strype (ii. 500) supposed, with many others, that the "Flores Historiarum" was really written by Matthew of Westminster. Sir Francis Palgrave pointed out that such a person "was a phantom who never existed," and Sir F. Madden is of the same opinion. Sir T. D. Hardy, however, combats this supposition at considerable length.<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Pref. to Catalogue of British History, iii, lxxxii.



CHAP.  
XV.Matthew  
Parker.

1559-75.

supplemented by the more recent investigations of Petrie, Hardy, Riley, Madden, and others.

I. Of the "Flores Historiarum," Hardy says, "It was

He, with his usual ability, contends that a Matthew of Westminster did exist; and if this be the case, Parker is right, and Sir F. Madden wrong. Of one of the manuscripts<sup>1</sup> on which occur the words "*secundum Matthæum monachum Westmonasterii*," Sir T. D. Hardy remarks, that it was written for Henry Spencer, who held the see of Norwich from 1370 to 1406; and the copyist of the Cottonian MS. would not have ascribed a book to "a phantom who never existed." If Bishop Spencer had not known Matthew of Westminster by name at least, he would hardly have permitted a history to be copied for his own use and ascribed to a man who had no claim to it. He continues, "it is certainly illogical to assert that a man never existed because you cannot prove that he lived." Sir T. D. Hardy has long and patiently examined the subject at p. 319 of his most useful and learned work. At p. 317 he describes the MS. of the "*Flores Historiarum*" used by Parker as "a very beautiful one." "In Parker's time,"—however, and indeed down to the present day—says Sir F. Madden (p. xx), "this work has been taken to be a compilation made by a writer of the fourteenth century named Matthew of Westminster;" and he then undertakes to show, from *the original copy of the work*, which he discovered in the Chetham Library at Manchester, that it is really only an abridgment of the greater chronicle of Matthew Paris; part of which is in his own handwriting (doubtless written in the Scriptorium of St. Albans), and that it was continued at St. Albans by another hand until 1265. "It would then seem to have been removed to St. Peter's, Westminster, where the work was carried on by the monks of that monastery. This compilation became more popular than the more diffuse chronicle of Matthew Paris, and, as emanating from the great monasteries of St. Albans and Westminster, was full of interest. Copies were therefore made for the use of many other houses." Sir F. Madden makes the very probable conjecture, that Matthew Paris originally made this abridgment for the use of the monks of Westminster, and that the MS. was therefore taken to Westminster, where other writers continued it. He says, "It was no doubt from the fact, that the latter portion of the '*Flores Historiarum*' was composed by a Westminster monk, that the entire work was afterwards attributed to a

<sup>1</sup> Catalogue of British History, iii. 324.

edited in 1567, by the celebrated Matthew Parker, Archbishop of Canterbury, who devoted the hours unemployed in the discharge of his arduous duties, not only to the study of the Early English language, but also to the cultivation of English antiquities generally. Had that learned and laborious prelate been aware of the relative value of our early national historians, he would undoubtedly have selected for publication some work of more authority and originality than is possessed by the ‘*Flores Historiarum*.’” He goes on to show this; but it is to be remarked, that the archbishop had long\* before made search for the larger history of Matthew Paris—without success—and that, as soon as he discovered a manuscript of it, he proceeded at once to publish it.

Sir F. Madden has the following observations on the two editions of this work:—“1. The edition of 1567 was printed wholly (with the exception of the last year, 1307) from a MS. now preserved in Eton College, which was

CHAP.

XV.

Matthew  
Parker.

1559-75.

Flores  
Histo-  
riarum.

Matthew of *Westminster*; for the name of Matthew<sup>1</sup> really belonged to Matthew *Paris*, while the affix of *Westminster* was supplied by conjecture; and this pseudonym having been recognized by Bale and Josceline, and adopted by Archbishop Parker, the error has been perpetuated to our own times.” A remarkable instance of this is, that it appears in Bohn’s series as an independent work, which the translator observes, is much on the plan of Matthew Paris! and it so appears in Lowndes’ Catalogue.

\* Six years before, Matthias Flacius (Francowitz), surnamed Illyricus, before mentioned, had been applied to by Parker, asking him to make search for a copy of Matthew Paris, since in England he had searched in vain. Illyricus could send him only some extracts made by a friend. Corresp. p. 140. This friend, Sir F. Madden supposes to have been Bale. Pref. xxix.

<sup>1</sup> And this is all that Parker himself seems to have stated. See Sir F. Madden’s Preface, p. liy. The chronicle begins with the rubric, Incipit Prologus, &c., over which the archbishop has written—Author Matthæus.

CHAP.  
XV.

Matthew  
Parker.

1559-75.

written at Merton Abbey. 2. The edition of 1570 is founded on the former, but enlarged from a MS. now in the Bodleian (no doubt the 'vetustissimum exemplar' mentioned by Parker in his preface); and thirdly, from the Cottonian MS. (Claudius, E. viii.), written by Henry Spencer, Bishop of Norwich, before the year 1406. In all three of these MSS., particularly the first, are marginal notes in *Parker's handwriting*, and from these notes we learn that he had the Eton MS. in his hands in 1562. Besides the above MSS., represented in the edition of 1570, Parker has occasionally borrowed from the Rochester copy of the work (Cott. Nero, D. ii.), and taken many other passages from various editions." It may be mentioned, that, in his preface, Parker pointed out, that "the part of the 'Flores Historiarum,' previous to the Conquest, had been borrowed almost verbally from the larger chronicle of Matthew Paris (itself based on Wendover), and that onwards, to the year 1259, the same authority had been closely followed, but much abridged and transposed, with some occasional additions."

Matthew  
Paris.

II. The next work to be noticed is the "Historia Major" of Matthew Paris. Hardy says, "Parker formed his text upon several MSS., but not with sufficient exactness, as it has been shown by Wats." He then mentions some other MSS., and gives an analysis of Matthew Paris. Sir F. Madden has carefully enumerated all Parker's materials. Armed with the power given him by the Privy Council, the archbishop obtained—1. From Edward Aglionby, Esq., of Balsall Temple, Warwick, the first volume of the "Flores Historiarum" to the end of 1188. 2. From Sir Henry Sidney, Lord Deputy of Ireland, the second volume, from 1189 to 1253 (the greater part of this in the handwriting of Matthew Paris himself). 3. A manuscript belonging to Sir William Cecil, commencing



in 1066, and ending in 1208.\* 4. The Earl of Arundel† had lent him a valuable volume containing the “*Historia Anglorum*,” and the end of the larger work from 1254 to 1257, the whole in Matthew Paris’s writing. 5. A manuscript belonging to Stow, by the aid of which some deficiencies in the Sidney manuscript were supplied.‡ These were, it is remarked, ample materials, and “they were all the copies of Matthew Paris then known to exist ;

CHAP.  
XV.  
Matthew  
Parker.  
1559-75.

\* Of this MS., Sir F. Madden gives a particular account, Preface, p. lxvi. It is mentioned by Parker in his own preface to the edition of 1571. What became of it after Cecil’s death is not known, nor in what manner it passed into the hands of Colbert ; but it was purchased with the rest of his manuscripts in 1732 for the *Bibliothèque du Roi*. The manuscript is in folio, written on paper in a small neat hand, probably about 1420-30, and consists of 156 leaves. Parker has written at the bottom of the first page, “*Manus ejusdem qui scripsit Chronicon Thomæ Walsingham*,”<sup>1</sup> “and in this conjecture,” observes Sir F. Madden, “he was correct.” “The writing is certainly the same in both MSS. (as I have ascertained by means of a carefully-executed facsimile from the Cecil copy), and the paper-mark—a pair of scales—is common to both.”

† Allusion is made to this in *Corresp.* p. 388. Its subsequent history after the death of its owner, Henry Fitzalan, last Earl of Arundel, is given in Sir F. Madden’s preface, p. xlv.

‡ The first two are now in Corpus Christi College, Cambridge ; the Cecil MS. is in the *Bibliothèque Impériale* at Paris ; the Arundel MS. is in the British Museum ; and Stow’s MS. among the Cottonian MSS.

---

<sup>1</sup> In the volume just issued in the Rolls series (*Catalogue, British History*, vol. iii.), Sir T. D. Hardy has some interesting remarks on the ancient Scriptoria, and on the Scriptorium at St. Albans in particular ; and at p. xl. are some remarks on plagiarism by the monastic annalist which seem almost applicable to the persons who transcribed for Parker. “The monastic annalist,” he says, “was at one time a transcriber, at another time an abridger, at another an original author. With him plagiarism was no crime and no degradation, for what others had done well before him, he felt it unnecessary to recast in another and perhaps less perfect form. He epitomized, or curtailed, or adopted the works of his predecessors in the same path without alteration and without acknowledgment. The motives and the objects of the medieval chronicler were different from those of the modern historian. He did not consider himself tied to those restrictions to which the latter implicitly submits,” &c.



CHAP.  
XV.

Matthew  
Parker.

1559-75.

so that the archbishop was justified in remarking, '*quod rara sint et paucissima hujus Historiæ exemplaria, quæ hodie extant*'—i.e. in comparison with other early historians" ("and after the lapse of three centuries," observes Sir F. Madden, "this statement remains uncontradicted").

We are informed in the preface of Sir F. Madden,\* of the special parts which for this edition were taken from the several manuscripts; and portions were taken from all five.† "Not that," it is remarked, "any single MS. was mentioned at all, but interpolated throughout from others, or altered by conjectural and arbitrary readings."

The commencement of this edition of Matthew Paris, "De Chronographia," which Parker took from the Cecil manuscript, is printed by Sir F. Madden, after his preface, and the errors are pointed out.

The next chronicle published by Parker is—

Thomas  
Walsing-  
ham.

III. Walsingham's "Historia Anglicana and Hypodigma Neustriæ." Petrie speaks of the first as *Historia Anglia*, of which one does not see the sense. It must be either a misprint for *Angliæ* or *Anglicana*. The proper title, however, has been before mentioned. Mr. Riley says, "the English History of Walsingham was first published in the year 1574, under the auspices, if not the immediate supervision, of Parker; and it again appeared in 1603, edited by Camden." The typography of

\* Page xxxiii.

† He had intended to chiefly use the Cecil MS., which is described as originally "garbled." This he caused "to be transcribed for the press," as is stated by Wats; and as Parker's transcriber used gréat licence of addition and interpolation, and this on what had been before garbled, it is to be imagined what sort of text must have been sent to the printer. The truth seems to be, that Parker did little but read and make notes on the MSS. copied for him, and which he supposed correct, and that his editor and transcriber (perhaps the same person) made the final revise.

Parker's text is very inaccurate, and the transcriber of the MS., from which it is derived, whoever he or they may have been, has done the work of extension no better. It seems likely that the transcriber was the same as that employed on Matthew Paris.\* "Camden's version," continues Mr. Riley, "is hardly a less unfavourable specimen of printing in point of accuracy than Parker's, perhaps more so." With respect to the manuscripts used by Parker for his edition of Walsingham, Mr. Riley is in error. He observes, "Archbishop Parker has given us no information in his preface as to the MS. or MSS. to which he was indebted for his text. It would seem, however, to have been derived to a great extent, either directly from the Arundel MS., or from a very close copy of it." But Sir F. Madden has since found, not only that the manuscript used by Parker was written by the same person who wrote the Cecil manuscript of Matthew Paris, but that the manuscript itself is in Corpus Christi College, Cambridge, and that it has Parker's notes in its margins.† In Parker's preface, which is printed by Mr. Riley, he inveighs against the papal discipline, and the monastic stories ‡ narrated by Walsingham—"fabulas

CHAP.  
XV.

Matthew  
Parker.  
1559-75.

\* At least some one remarkably careless. "So multiplied," says Mr. Riley, "are the omissions and errors that have been made in transcription, that it is hardly better, as seen in Parker's and Camden's volumes," than a hopeless mass of corruption. (Pref. xiii.) In his preface to vol. ii. p. xvii. Mr. Riley again observes:—"The utter worthlessness of the text of 'Walsingham's History,' as given in Parker's and Camden's editions, is perhaps nowhere more strikingly seen than in the portion which bears reference to the proceedings against Wyclif in 1378. Indeed, it seems quite incomprehensible how Archbishop Parker or Camden could have given the sanction of his name to such a mass of perversion and absolute nonsense."

† Pref. p. lxvi.

‡ Page 3. He observes, that the Papists could not deny that in the

CHAP.  
XV.

Matthew  
Parker.  
1559-75.

monasticas et aniles ineptias." He refers to "Matthew of Westminster" and Matthew Paris, and mentions that at that time no one gave credence to the legendary exploits of Dunstan and Wulfstan,\* but considers that they ought to be preserved; and says, that "although there is much that is mendacious in these histories, it should not on that account be doubted that they contain much which is true."

Mr. Riley† has given an elaborate account of the various manuscripts, both of Walsingham's "History" and of his "Ypodigma Neustriæ," now remaining in Corpus Christi College, Cambridge, and it is probable that all the manuscripts used by Parker are there preserved.

Asser's  
Life of  
Alfred.

IV. "Asser's 'Life of Alfred,'" says Sir Thomas Hardy, "was first published by Archbishop Parker in 1574, at London, in folio;" and he adds, that search was afterwards made for the manuscripts used for the edition, and what follows shows that Parker in this instance probably gave to his text a careful revision. "A Mr. T. James inspected more than one hundred volumes of manuscripts at Bene't College, but could find no copy of Asser; but on his return to London, on the last day of March, 1600, he saw a manuscript in Lord Lumley's library, which he was told, and from certain indications he was persuaded that he was told rightly, was the old copy used by Archbishop Parker. . . . He added further, that it had ochre (minium) marks, such as Parker usually made in the books which he read,‡ and

English Church, before the dissolution of the monasteries, fables and legends were circulated as truths.

\* Page 5.

† See preface to his second volume.

‡ Hardy (pp. 80, 81) has a long discussion as to the assertions of Usher and others, that Parker made additions to the text of Asser, which were afterwards servilely followed by Camden; and he explains it in this way. In the manuscript volume in Corpus Christi College,

that it was written in at least two hands, the latter portion in the latest." From the great mistake \* which Parker made in interpolating with the genuine text of Asser, legendary stories and erroneous statements from the "*Chronicon Fani S. Neoti sive Annales Johannes Asserii*," doubts have been cast upon the authenticity of Asser's "*Life of Alfred*" which would probably never have otherwise arisen. In Petrie's edition the corrections have been adopted which were made by Wise in 1722. Parker's own preface to Asser deserves especial notice. He says, that he sets forth to the reader the history of the excellent King Alfred, who formerly ruled nearly all Britain, written by John Asser, Bishop of Sherborne, and that he has done so in Latin; that the work would be found on perusal both pleasant and useful, and that if one would fix the mind in contemplation of the exceedingly illustrious deeds of which it speaks, they might be realized by the imagination. He then proceeds to give his reasons for printing the work also in Saxon characters, and next uses the expressions for which he has been so severely

CHAP.  
XV.

Matthew  
Parker.  
1559-75.

Cambridge, separated only by a few leaves from the *Gesta Alfredi* of Asser, which is usually held to be genuine, is a copy of the "*Annales*," "a bad compilation from the Saxon chronicle, and from various unauthentic legends."<sup>1</sup> A spurious composition. "These Parker combined, mingling truth with error, in the endeavour" to make a more complete text of the "*Life of Alfred*;" and Hardy observes on this, "It is difficult to find an apology for Archbishop Parker's mode of thus editing an author, more especially after his protestations of strict accuracy; but it may be urged in extenuation of the fault, that it must have originated in ignorance." He conjectures that Parker erroneously supposed that the "*Life of Alfred*" and the "*Annales*" were written by the same person.

\* The interpolations made by Parker are given by Hardy in his notes to the text.

---

<sup>1</sup> Preface to Pauli's *Life of Alfred*, p. 4.



CHAP.  
XV.

Matthew  
Parker.

1559-75.

censured—"Quod autem ad historiæ fidem attinet lector humanissime, hoc te scire volo, eam me semper rationem secutum, *in omnibus iis libris, quos divulgavi, nihil ut de meo adjecerim aut diminuerim*, sed cuncta prout in primis exemplaribus reperiuntur *ad verbum* expresserim," and reiterates this statement by declaring, that the originals in the library of Corpus Christi College, Cambridge, would perpetually testify this, where anyone, by comparing them with his editions, would find that he had neither added to nor taken from them; but that they had been most faithfully followed—"Ubi si quis cum codicibus manuscriptis, impressos comparare voluerit, enimvero nihil nos aut detraxisse, aut addidisse inveniet sed summam ubique fidem et religionem præstitisse." \*

Asser was probably the last of the three works edited in 1574. It came out towards the end of November, as appears from the Correspondence,† and in his letter to Cecil he speaks of it as a "story." "This last *addition* (sic) of 'Alfred's Life,' I have added to such stories as before I sent to my Lord Arundel, which yet being so homely I would not have done if his lordship had not seemed to desire it."

On the subject of the interpolations, blunderings, and additions in these various editions made by Parker's copyists, editors, or by Parker himself, it should be premised, that the standard by which they should be judged should certainly not be that of modern criticism. The editing of printed chronicles was at that time in its infancy; and Petrie remarks, that "editors then rarely examined into the degree of credibility which ought to

\* This is quoted by Strype, ii. 501, Petrie, p. 468, and again by Sir F. Madden, Pref. to Mat. Paris, p. xxxvi.

† Page 468. The archbishop sent the first copy to the queen on the morning of Nov. 23, 1574.

be attached to the work they were engaged upon, or on what MSS. the test of an author should be based ; " and while fully aware of the mistakes made by Parker, Petrie, always candid and lenient in his judgments, gives him the palm among his contemporaries, since he justly observes, that of all the historical works produced in England in the sixteenth century, with the *exception of the works of Parker* and Josceline, none are entitled to rank in the first class of historical literature.

On the other hand, Sir F. Madden, by placing side by side portions of Parker's edition of " Matthew Paris " with the text of the manuscript, shows that Parker, in endeavouring, as he probably thought, to improve on the original, made most unwarrantable alterations, and these chiefly in the way of additions. He says : \* " Are we really to believe that Parker was ignorant of the alterations and disfigurements of the authors published under his sanction, or must we be reduced to the necessity of supposing him to have written what he knew to be false ? It is a dilemma hard to determine, but I would willingly, if possible, throw the blame on the editor or printer,†

CHAP.  
XV.

Matthew  
Parker.  
1559-75.

\* Pref. p. xxxvii.

† Speaking of the " arbitrary corrections made by Parker, his editor, or his printer," Sir F. Madden observes, that " so far did the licence extend, that occasionally several lines, or even an entire paragraph, are inserted which will be sought for in vain in the MS." " There is, however, a passage in his preface (p. lxix.) which seems to me to clear up much of the difficulty. *Parker was himself deceived*, and certainly a great amount of blame is to be attached to his copyists. In Corpus Christi College, Cambridge, No. lvi., is a thick folio volume written by various hands of the sixteenth century for Archbishop Parker, in or about 1567 (the year in which the 'Flores Historiarum' was published)." The prologue, says Sir F. Madden, has been collated in the present edition, in order to show the extreme licence taken by the copyist in altering the original text. In the initial letter D are introduced the arms of Parker, and to carry out a silly conceit, of making the first

CHAP.  
XV.Matthew  
Parker.

1559-75.

rather than on the archbishop himself." Wats seems to think also that the blame was to be attributed to them. "The text had everywhere been altered and disfigured by the editor and printer;" and it may be observed, that Wats had in his hand Parker's transcript originally prepared for the press. It had been lent to him by Selden, and he describes it curiously as "aut fœde mutilus, aliorum transvorsus, aut denique horum vorum divariatus." Sir F. Madden finds equal fault with the "Flores Historiarum," speaking of it as "a mere piece of patchwork, exhibiting an utter disregard of the ordinary rules to be observed in publishing an historical work,"—forgetting that these rules had not at that time existence. Alluding, also, to one of the manuscripts of Matthew Paris which the archbishop used, he says, "It is worthy of remark how Archbishop Parker has dealt with the imperfect text at the end of the MS. He has crossed out with his pen the whole of it, and on the lower margin transcribed the short annual summary from the Arundel MS., printing it in the place of that struck out. The matter thus crossed out contained a chapter on the miracles of St. Richard in the church of Chichester," &c. Mr. Riley is almost as severe on this mode of editing as is Sir F. Madden,\* and in the preface to his second volume

eight lines commence with the vowel *e*, several words have been altered and so *printed*. The portion for the years 1254-73 has been used for the press, as appears by Parker's references to his edition in the margins. Whether, then, Parker himself interpolated or not, he was unwittingly using an interpolated manuscript. This too appears to have been the case with "Walsingham," on whom the same, or an equally incorrect transcriber would seem to have been employed. See Riley's Preface, p. i.

\* Sir T. D. Hardy dissents from the view taken by Sir F. Madden as to the MSS. in Corpus Christi College, Cambridge, being in the handwriting wholly of Matthew Paris, and gives good reason for sup-

he appears to have become more impressed by the number of perversions and inaccuracies he met with, and of which an account has been given in a previous note. Since Mr. Petrie's edition of "Asser," there has been no exact criticism of that work, it is therefore uncertain whether it was in any respect better than those of Matthew Parker or Walsingham. Parker never realized to his mind what the duties of an editor really are. A modern editor knows that it is his business to produce a correct copy of his author's works. Parker thought little of editor or author, but desired, through the writings of a man of mark, to edify the reader. Much of what would now be given in a note, he would have introduced by an interpolation of the original. His system would now be universally condemned; but it is always desirable when a good man is guilty of an unjustifiable action, to ascertain the cause of his self-deception. When doing wrong, he may have imagined that he was acting rightly. The wrong doing is to be censured; for the wrong doer some allowance may be made.

CHAP.  
XV.  
Matthew  
Parker.  
1559-75.

The next book which calls for notice is Parker's "*De Antiquitate Britannicæ Ecclesiæ et Privilegiis Ecclesiæ Cantuariensis, cum Archiepiscopis ejusdem* 70, An. Dom. 1572." "It is said that only twenty-two copies were printed (but in all probability there were fifty)\* at the office of John Day." The date, 1572, seems to show that

De Anti-  
quitate  
Britan-  
nicæ  
Ecclesiæ.

posing that he did not write all that is ascribed to him. Pref. to Catalogue of British History, p. lv. At p. lxxx. he sums up his conclusions and the points in which he differs from Sir F. Madden.

\* From Parker's letter to Burghley, 9th of May, 1573, it is evident, however, that at that time few copies had been circulated. "Which book I have not given to four men in the realm." He gave one to the Earl of Arundel, as appears from the words in it:—"Ex dono Matthei Cantuariensis Archiepiscopi." Lowndes.



CHAP.  
XV.

Matthew  
Parker.

1559-75.

this work intervened between the publication of the chronicles. "Matthew Paris" was edited in 1571, "Walsingham" in 1574. There is a good account of this in Lowndes, with a description of the copy presented by the archbishop to Queen Elizabeth.

It may be noticed, that "Matthew Paris," which had been edited in the previous year, was frequently made use of. Although the entry made by the archbishop's son \* ascribes this book to Josceline, yet from Parker's letter to Burghley, in which he describes the meaning and object of the work, it is evident that Parker himself bestowed much time and labour upon it; indeed, he speaks of it as giving him occupation. † "Because neither my health nor my quiet would suffer me to be a common preacher, yet I thought it not unfit for me to be otherwise occupied in some points of religion; for my meaning was by this, my poor collection thus caused to be printed (and yet reserved to myself), to note at what time Augustine, my first predecessor, came into this land, what religion he brought in with him, and how it continued," &c.

Anyone reading the commencement of this book—The introduction of Christianity to Britain, &c.—can scarcely fail to be struck by the amount of research displayed, and the number of authorities cited. It seems, indeed, to be in advance of its age, and to be a very carefully written history, so that we may feel surprise at the tone in which Parker speaks of it in his letter to Burghley.‡

The introduction to this book, entitled "De Vetustate

\* Corresp. pref. p. xiii.

† Corresp. p. 425. In Lamb's *Masters' History of Corpus Christi College, Cambridge*, there is a discussion of the authorship of this book at considerable length (p. 111).

‡ Corresp. p. 424.

*Britannicæ Ecclesiæ Testimonia*," commences with many passages from the fathers, bearing more or less directly on the introduction of Christianity into Britain, and then describes the early persecutions and martyrdoms, the relapse of the Britons into idolatry, and the origin and changes of the episcopal sees. The next chapters are miscellaneous, and not arranged in chronological order. The privileges and prerogatives of Canterbury are described at great length; then follows a description of Canterbury itself, &c., ending with the mission of Augustine. The biographies then succeed Augustine to Matthæus. With respect to the work last mentioned, internal evidence seems to show that it could scarcely have been written by Parker himself, or, if so, it must have been materially altered by some other writer. Two points in it, however—the enumeration of the bishops consecrated by him, and the explicit way in which entertainments and royal visits are given—seem to show that it was the work of some member of Parker's household.

CHAP.  
XV.

Matthew  
Parker.  
1559-75.

As connected with this subject, we may here supply the reader with a description of the bequest of books and manuscripts made by the archbishop to the library of Corpus Christi College, Cambridge. Masters, in his observations on this collection,\* remarks, that the praise which Fuller bestowed on it is well deserved, "since it contained more materials relating to the history of this kingdom, both civil and ecclesiastical, than could before have been met with anywhere else;" for the greater safety whereof Parker ordered them to be kept under

\* In Strype, ii. 476, is an account of the twenty-one ranks or divisions of the books printed, and a brief account of the manuscript books and miscellaneous manuscripts. Some of the most important are specified.

CHAP.  
XV.Matthew  
Parker.

1559-75.

three locks, one key of which was to be lodged with the master, and the other two with the keepers of the Billingford chest (or hutch).<sup>\*</sup> The library was to have an annual supervision on August 6, on which occasion the supervisors were to dine together, two receiving 3s. 4d. each, and the two assistant scholars 1s. each, for overlooking it. Fines of 4d. for each leaf of a manuscript missing, for each sheet 2s., and for every printed book or manuscript a sum at their discretion, were to be forfeited. Three catalogues were to be made, and a registrar appointed for making transcripts. An extract from Parker's deed of gift is printed by Masters, from which it appears, that the library was to be open daily at stated hours—*i.e.* from 8 to 11 and 1 to 4 in the winter, and from 6 to 11 and 1 to 5 during the rest of the year. The books were not to be written in, or taken away except by the master or by a fellow, who might take three at a time to his residence, but not out of the college; such were to be entered in a catalogue by the registrar, and such entry signed. Provision was also made for proper transcription.<sup>†</sup> Nasmith, in the preface to his catalogue of the manuscripts, alludes to these rules:—" *Ea enim est lex hujus bibliothecæ a fundatore sancita, ut neque socius aliquis solus eam adire potest, sed semper alio socio vel scholari comitatus, neque plusquam tres codices in cameram suam asportare, idque non sine licentia magistri duorum sociorum prius impetrata.*" This regulation, he says, to the observance of which all were bound by oath, was a great hindrance to comparing the manuscripts one with another, and therefore, during the five years in which he

<sup>\*</sup> This hutch has been before alluded to. From a note entitled *De Cistis Academiæ*, it appears that it was jointly founded by Richard Billingforth and Thomas Bouchier, Archbishop of Canterbury.

<sup>†</sup> P. 105.

was occupied in making the catalogue, he was by the master and fellows exonerated from it. Nasmith, in stating his reason for compiling his catalogue, says, that in the first catalogue, very hastily made, to his surprise he was unable to find the names of the authors or the contents of the manuscripts correctly described. More than a hundred codices had been omitted. In the reign of William III., he says, Stanley, then master, drew up a fresh and very superior catalogue.\* That part of it, he says, devoted to the history and antiquities of the Church of England left nothing to be desired, while the rest was inferior. Masters alludes to "the care and pains necessary to finish a work of this kind, wherein the several volumes contain such a variety of tracts, some of which are often so imperfect, ill written, or faded through length of time, that it is no easy matter to get acquainted with their contents;" the reader will not therefore expect to find this first attempt without defects. He seems not to have known of a former catalogue. Nasmith mentions, that he retained the notes made by Parker and Josceline, following the examples of James and Stanley. His catalogue was prepared at the expense of Corpus Christi College, Cambridge. With respect to the books themselves, mentioned in Nasmith's catalogue, some few may call for special notice—*e. g.* a manuscript of Matthew Paris, which is fully

CHAP.  
XV.

Matthew  
Parker.  
1559-75.

\* This is mentioned by Masters in his "Life of Stanley," p.\*204. It was published at his own expense, and was entitled "Catalogus Librorum Manuscriptorum in Bibliotheca Coll. Corp. Christi in Cantabrigia quos legavit Matthæus Parkerus Archiepiscopus Cantuariensis," fol. Lond. 1722. This, Masters observes, was superseded by Mr. Nasmith's catalogue, published in 1777, half a century later. Nasmith mentions that he did not understand Anglo-Saxon, and had in this respect followed his predecessor.



CHAP.  
XV.

Matthew  
Parker.  
1559-75.

described,\* the Psalter,† the very curious account of “The Romance of the Holy Grayl,” which may be compared with Tennyson’s magnificent poem—the title given to it by Josceline was “Acta quædam Arthuri regis;”‡ “Notæ chronologicæ de Ælfredo manu Matthei Parker;” § “Excerpta et registro Eccl. Cicest. viz. de translatione sedis episcopalis a Celisia ad Cicestriam, &c.;” || a number of letters relating to Bucer, ¶ among which is “a treatise concerning the immediate going to heaven of the souls of the faithful fathers before Christ; and that Christ did not descend into hell, by Christopher Carlile;” to this is appended a memorandum—“this book exhibited and delivered the 20th day of August, 1563, to the most reverend father in God, the Lord Matthu Archbishopp of Cant. by me, Thomas Tailor,” &c. . . . “the doctrine whereof I neither allow nor approve.” It may be observed, that when Parker revised the Articles, he struck out from the end of the article as we now have it, all that related to the preaching to the spirits in prison. Probably this book may have had something to do with the alteration. “Henricus VIII. Angliæ Franciæ, &c. rex, contra Germanorum opinionones, &c., with notes by Parker;” \*\* also several books on the marriage of priests, which Parker most likely used; “The Articles of 1562,” with Nasmith’s observations on the alterations made by Parker; †† “A Life of Cranmer;”—“this was written by the desire of Archbishop Parker, by one who had been a domestic of Cranmer’s, and, though concise, contains many curious anecdotes, most of which have

\* P. 15.

§ P. 65.

\*\* P. 115.

† P. 33.

|| P. 71.

†† P. 193.

‡ P. 54.

¶ P. 72.

been inserted by Strype in his life of Cranmer ;” \*  
 “Collectanea quædam de metro et versu cum multis versibus”—Parker may have used this when versifying the Psalms ; he has written these words on the first page :  
 “Hic libellus vilis videri potest, sed nullus liber tam humilis quin ejus aliquis usus esse potest, ut in hoc videre licet artem componendorum carminum, qua usi sunt poetæ posterioris temporis in versibus suis resonantibus, fortasse non facile reperias alibi rationem qua usi sunt.” †

CHAP.  
XV.

Matthew  
Parker.  
1559-75.

Parker had determined on bequeathing these books and manuscripts to Corpus Christi College, Cambridge, some time before his death. “The first indenture whereby this benefaction was given bears date 1569.” This was superseded by others in 1571 and 1574 ; but they were not delivered till after his decease. The manuscript library, which was kept in a room over the ante-chapel, was removed to a private room in 1824, where it had a narrow escape from being destroyed by fire. It remained there till the summer of 1827. It has been remarked, as a proof of “the care that has been taken of this valuable collection, that not one of the manuscripts is missing, though they have been in the possession of the college above two hundred and fifty years (*i.e.* in 1831). They are now,” says Lamb, “placed at the west end of the new library, which is fireproof, so that they are not exposed to that danger in which they were in the old building.” ‡

We may conclude this chapter with a list of the books edited or composed by Parker ; and whatever else may be thought of his literary character, there can be but one opinion of his industry.

\* P. 204.

† P. 374.

‡ Hist. Corpus Christi College, Cambridge, p. 265.

CHAP.  
XV.

Matthew  
Parker.  
1559-75.

1. Statuta collegii de Stoke juxta Clare.\*
2. Statuta Collegii Corporis Christi et Beatae Mariae Virginis Cantabrigiae.†
3. Orationes habitæ coram senatu Cantab.‡
4. Black paper book of the University.§
5. Black paper book of the proctors' accounts.||
6. Historia de Fundatione et Statu Collegii Corporis Christi.¶
7. Howe we ought to take the death of the Godly. A sermon made in Cambridge at the Burial of the noble Clerck D. M. Bucer. Lond. (Jugge) 8vo. n. d.

8. The whole Psalter translated into English metre, which containeth an hundredth and fifty Psalmes. London, 4to. (J. Day) n. d. Divided into three parts or quinquagenes, each containing fifty Psalms.

9. Journal of memorable things happening to him from the year of his birth to the year wherein he was made archbishop.\*\*

10. A note of the differences between King Edward the Sixth's Common Prayer and that of her Majesty.††

11. A declaration of certain principal articles of religion set out by the order of both archbishops, metropolitans, and the rest of the bishops for uniformity of doctrine to be taught and holden of all parsons, vicars, and curates, as well in testification of their common consent in the said doctrine to the stopping of the mouths of them that go about to slander the ministers of the Church for diversity of judgment, as necessary for the instruction of their people. Lond. (R. Jugge) 1561.

\* MS. Corpus Christi College, Cambridge, 108, pp. 155, 171.

† In Masters' Hist. of C.C.C.C., ed. Lamb, p. 279.

‡ MS. C.C.C.C. 106, pp. 417\*, 419\*, 423\*, 428.

§ Ibid. p. 43.

|| Ibid. p. 45.

¶ MS. Strype's Parker, 15, p. 487. A translation of part of this work appeared in 1573, under the title of "The life off the 70 Archbishop of Canterbury, presentlye settinge, Englished, and to be added to the 69 lately sett forth in Latin. The number of seventy is so compleat a number as it is great pitie there should be one more: but as Augustin was the first, so Mathew might be the last."

\*\* MS. C.C.C.C.

†† MS. Lansd. 120, art. 4.

12. A Form of Prayer commanded to be used for her Majesty's safety, and the good estate of the nation, and of the religion professed therein. 1559-60.

13. A shourte fourme and order to be used in Common prayer thrise a weke for sesonable wether, and good successe of the Common affaires of the Realme: meate to be used at this presente and also hereafter when like occasion shall aryse, by the discrecyon of the Ordinaries within the province of Canterbury. Lond. (Jugge) 8vo. 1560.

14. Articles for the dioceses to be inquired of in his metropolitical visitation.\*

15. Statutes for the government and settlement of the hospitals of S. John the Baptist in Canterbury and S. Nicholas in Harboldown. Dated Sept. 15, 1560, with additions Aug. 20, 1565, and May 20, 1574.†

16. An Admonition for the necessity of the present time, till a further consultation, to all such as shall intend hereafter to enter the state of matrimony godly, and agreeable to law. Lond. 1560. With a shorter title, Lond. 1563.

17. A Defence of Priests' Marriages, established by the Imperial Laws of the Realm of England: against a Civilian naming himself Thomas Martin, Doctor of the Civil Laws, going about to disprove the said Marriages lawful by the eternal Word of God, and by the High Court of Parliament: only forbid by foreign Laws, and Canons of the Pope, coloured with a visour of the Church. Which Laws and Canons were extinguished by the Parliament, and so abrogated by the Convocation in their Synod by their Subscriptions, &c. Lond. 4to.

18. A Prayer to be used for the present estate in Churches, at the end of the litanie, on Sondaies, Wednesdaies, and Frydaies, throughe the whole Realme.‡

19. A Fourme to be used in Common prayer twyse aweke, and also an order of publique fast, to be used every Wednesday in the weeke, duryng this tyme of mortalitie, and other afflictions, wherewith the Realm at this present is visited. Set forth

\* Strype's Life, Append. No. XI.

† Ibid. No. XIII,

‡ Claye's Liturgical Services, p. 476.



CHAP.  
XV.Matthew  
Parker.  
1559-75.

by the Queenes majesties speciall commandement, expressed in her letters hereafter followyng in the next page. XXX. Julii. 1563. Lond. 4to.

20. The manner how the Church of England is administered and governed. With Lady Bacon's translation of Jewel's Apology. Lond. 8vo. 1564. From this we have quoted largely in a former chapter.

21. A godly and necessarye admonition of the Decrees and Canons of the Counsel of Trent celebrated under Pius the fourth, Byshop of Rome, in the yeares of our Lord M.D.LXII. and M.D.LXIII. Written, for those godly disposed persons sakes, whych looke for amendment of Doctrine and Ceremonies to bee made in generall Counsels. Lately translated out of Latin. Lond. 4to. 1564.

22. Advertisements partly for due order in the publique administration of common prayers, and usinge the holy sacramentes, and partly for the apparell of all persons ecclesiasticall by virtue of the Queenes majesties letters, commanding the same, the 25th day of January, in the seventh year of the raigne of our soveraigne lady Elizabeth, by the grace of God of Englande, Fraunce, and Ireland queene, defender of the faith, &c.\*

23. A fourme to be used in Common Prayer every Sunday, Wednesday, and Fryday, through the whole Realme. To excite and stirre up all godly people to prey unto God for the preservation of those Christians, and their countreys, that are now invaded by the Turke in Hungary, or elsewhere. Lond. 4to. (Jugge and Cawood) 1565.

24. A Dietary; being ordinances for the prices of victuals and diet of the clergy, for the preventing of Dearths.†

25. A brief and lamentable consideration of the apparel now used by the clergy of England set out by a faithful servant of God for the instruction of the weak. Lond. 8vo. 1565.

\* Strype's Life, Append. No. XXVIII. These were drawn up by the archbishop with the assistance of other bishops. They were signed by him and the Bishops of London, Ely, Rochester, Winchester, and Lincoln, as commissioners in causes ecclesiastical.

† Strype's Collectanea, No. XXXIII.

CHAP.  
XV.Matthew  
Parker.

1559-75

26. An examination for the time, of a certain declaration lately put in print in the name and defence of certain ministers of London, refusing to wear the apparel prescribed by the laws and orders of the realm. Lond. 4to. 1566.

27. A Testimonie of Antiquitie showing the auncient fayth in the Church of England touching the sacrament of the body and bloude of the Lord here publikely preached, and also receaved in the Saxons tyme, above 600 years ago. Lond. 4to. 1623.\*

28. Articles to be inquired of in his metropolical visitation in al and singular cathedral and collegiate churches within the province of Canterbury (1567).

29. Flores Historiarum per Matthæum Westmonasteriensem collecti, Præcipuè de rebus Britannicis ab exordio mundi usque ad Annum Domini 1307. Lond. fo. 1567-1570. With a preface by the Archbishop.

30. The sum of the Scripture: The tables of Christ's line: The Argument of the Scriptures: The first Preface into the whole Bible: The Preface into the Psalter: The Preface into the New Testament, Genesis, Exodus, Matthew, Mark, 2 Corinth., Galatians, Ephesians, Philippians, Colossians, Thessalonians, Timothy, Titus, Philemon, Hebrews.†

31. Statutes for the hospital of Eastbridge in Canterbury. Dated 20 May, 1569.‡

32. A Prayer; at the end of the Homilie against disobedience and wyful rebellion, 1569.

33. The entry of the most sacred majestie imperiall, done in the city of Ausbora (Augsburg) the XV daie of June, in the yeare of our Lorde 1530, withe the godly and devoute procession made on the morrowe, being the XVI daie of the same moneth,

\* It contains sermon by abbot Elfric, of the Paschal Lamb, the epistles of Elfric to Wolfstan, the Lord's Prayer, the Creed, the Ten Commandments in Saxon. The sermon both in Saxon and English is incorrectly given in the later editions of Foxe's Acts and Monuments. The preface to the sermon is by Parker.

† In the Bishops' Bible, 1568.

‡ Strype's Life, Append. No. LVIII.

CHAP.  
XV.Matthew  
Parker.  
1559-75.

in the which the emperours majestie being bareheaded did carry a torche of white waxe.\* Translated by the archbishop in 1569 from a French book printed at Antwerp, 1530.

34. Articles to be enquired of within the diocese of Canterbury in his ordinary visitation in the yeare of our Lorde God MDLXIX.†

35. A Thankes Geving for the suppression of the late rebellion (1569-70).

36. Observations for orders to be taken in the Court of Faculties (1570).‡

37. Injunctiones datæ in visitatione 1570.§

38. Injunctions for the church of Canterbury, 1570.

39. Matthæi Paris Monachi Albanensis Angli Historia major. Lond. fo. 1571.

40. Liber quorundam canonum disciplinæ ecclesiæ Anglicanæ anno MDLXXI. Lond. (J. Day).||

41. The Gospels of the fower Evangelistes translated in the olde Saxons tyme out of Latin into the vulgare tounge of the Saxons newly collected out of Auncient Monumentes of the sayd Saxons and now published for testimonie of the same. Lond. 4to. 1571. Dedicated by John Fox to Queen Elizabeth.

42. A Fourme of Common Prayer to be used, and so commanded by auctoritie of the Queenes Majestie, and necessarie for the present tyme and state, 1572. 27 Octob., London, 4to.¶

43. De Antiquitate Britannicæ Ecclesiæ et Privilegiis Ecclesiæ Cantuariensis, cum Archiepiscopis ejusdem 70, An. Dom. 1572. Lond. folio. An incorrect edition. Hanover, fo. 1605. A beautiful and elegant edition by Sam. Drake, D.D. fellow of S. John's College, Cambridge, Lond. fo. 1729.

\* MS. C.C.C.C. 111, p. 359.

† Wilkins' Concilia, iv. 257.

‡ Strype's Life, p. 300.

§ MS. C.C.C.C. 120, p. 9.

|| In framing these canons Parker was assisted by the Bishops of Ely and Winchester.

¶ On occasion of the massacre of St. Bartholomew. Of the original edition, it has been observed by Cooper, that hardly any two copies are alike, and that most of them want the archbishop's own life, he having out of modesty suppressed it whilst he lived.

44. Catalogus Cancellariorum, Procancellariorum, Procuratorum, ac eorum, qui in Academia Cantabrigiensi ad Gradum Doctoratus aspiraverunt. Et numerus omnium Graduatorum ab anno 1500 usque ad annum 1571.\*

45. Indulta Regum, Compositiones, Indenturæ, &c. Cantab. Particulæ quæ Cantabrigiensis Academiæ Magistratibus ac ministris conservandæ successive traduntur. List of books given by the Archbishop, Sir Nicholas Bacon, Robert Horne, Bishop of Winchester, and James Pilkington, Bishop of Durham, to the university library. De Scholarum Collegiorumque in Academia Cantabrigiensi Patronis ac Fundatoribus. Episcopi ex Academia Cantabrigiensi qui ab anno Christi 1500 usque ad annum 1571 principi et regno servierunt.†

46. Oratio eorum Synodo, 9 Maii, 1572 auspicante.‡

47. Order made between Thomas, bishop of Lincoln, and John Aelmer, D.D., archdeacon of Lincoln, about their jurisdictions. Dated 10 July, 1572.§

48. Articles of Enquiry within the Diocese of Winchester in his metropolitall visitation. Lond. 4to. 1572.

49. The progress of Queen Elizabeth through the county of Kent in the year 1573.||

50. Orders for Apparitors, 1573.¶

51. Statuta quædam edita Maii 6, anno Domini MDLXXIII. et auctoritate sua in curia de arcubus publicata.\*\*

52. Injunctiones in metropolitana et ordinaria visitatione cathedralis ecclesiæ Christi Cantuar., die septimo Octob. anno MDLXXIII.††

53. Historia Brevis Thomæ Walsingham ab Edwardo primo ad Henricum quintum et Ypodigma Neustriæ vel Normanniæ. Lond. fo. 1574.

54. Alfredi Regis res gestæ ab Asserio Shirburniensi Episcopo

\* With Antiq. Brit.

† Ibid.

‡ Strype's Life, Append. No. LXXXI.

§ Ibid. No. LXV.

|| With a few copies of Antiq. Brit. Reprinted in Nichols' Prog. Eliz.

¶ Strype's Life, p. 442.

\*\* Wilkins' Concilia, iv. 273.

†† Strype's Parker, Append. No. XCII.



CHAP.  
XV.Matthew  
Parker.  
1559-75.

conscriptæ. Lond. fo. 1574. Printed in Saxon letters with Parker's preface.

55. *Itinerarium Gyraldi Cambrensis.*

56. Preface to *Reformatio Legum Ecclesiasticarum*.\*

57. Discourse against alienation of the revenues of the church.†

58. *Breves Notæ de regulis eccl. Gall. et Belg. prescribendis*.‡

59. For orders in apparel, and other things at Oxford.§

60. A book relating to his charitable foundations.||

61. Arguments in defence of the Court of Faculties.¶

62. A collection of titles or instances in and for which Faculties may have been granted.\*\*

63. Letters; these have been published under the title of the Correspondence of Matthew Parker, D.D., Archbishop of Canterbury, under the able editorship of John Bruce, Esq., and the Rev. Thomas Thomason Perowne, M.A., and to them under this title frequent reference has been made throughout this volume.

A condition was attached to the donation of the library to Corpus Christi or Bene't College—that in case six folio, eight quarto, and twelve smaller volumes containing MSS. be lost, the whole collection shall be transferred to Caius College; and if the number be further diminished, to Trinity Hall.

\* Strype's Life, p. 508.

† MS. C.C.C.C.

‡ MS. C.C.C.C. 104, p. 239.

§ Strype's Life, Append. No. XL.

|| MS. in possession of the Corporation of Norwich.

¶ MS. Lansd. 109, art. 23.

\*\* Ibid. art. 24.

## CHAPTER XVI.

## PRIVATE AND DOMESTIC LIFE.

The lordly state of bishops defended.—Addition to Parker's coat-of-arms.—The motto assumed by Parker attests his humility.—Parker's seal.—Sustained the "port" of a bishop.—His household, order, attendance.—Definition of duties to the members of his family.—Paid high wages.—Surprising that he should be accused of penuriousness.—Accused to Cecil both of extravagance and penuriousness.—Sir John Parker's description of the revenues of the sea.—Cheque Roll.—Benefactions to his University and College.—Dilapidated state of the property.—Repairs at Lambeth and at Canterbury.—Parker's care of the accounts.—Repairs at Bekesbourne.—Increases the endowment of the Bekesbourne living.—Rebuilds his house at Bekesbourne.—Revenues from Ford.—Opposition of the courtiers.—Lambeth Manor House converted into the Palace of the see of Canterbury.—Splendour of Parker's entertainments.—Robbery of the episcopal estates.—The three festivals at Canterbury.—The archbishop continued to entertain ambassadors, and to act as jailer to state prisoners.—Tunstall, Boxall, Thirlby, Lord Henry Howard, Lord Stourton.—Schedule of state prisoners.—French ambassador entertained by Parker.—Mrs. Parker's private apartments.—The archbishop stands, with the queen and the Duke of Norfolk, sponsor to the child of the Margrave of Baden.—He receives the communion with the queen.—Visit of the queen to the archbishop in 1560.—Noble members of Parker's household.—His table.—Provision for his wife.—For his children.—Death of Mrs. Parker.—Death of Parker's second son.—The queen visits the archbishop at Lambeth.—The queen's maundy.—She visits the archbishop at Croydon.—Visits him at Canterbury.—Parker's contemporaries.—Prepares his tomb.—His will.—Death and funeral.

WHEN we pass from the public to the private life of Matthew Parker, we find him accused by some of his adversaries of penuriousness, and by others of a love of

CHAP.  
XVI.

Matthew  
Parker.  
1559-75.

CHAP.  
XVI.

Matthew  
Parker.

1559-75.

Accused of  
luxurious  
living.

His de-  
fence.

display—exhibited in the lordly establishment he maintained, and the state with which he was served.

It is very true, that when he was called upon to occupy the first place in the realm next to royalty itself, he determined to uphold the dignity of his station; but his whole character shows that, in so doing, he was not indulging a vain-glorious disposition, but that he was acting on principle—even if the principle were a mistaken one. He was a bishop, and the lowest offices of the episcopal character he was prepared to perform; but he was also a prince of the Church, and, when he ascended the episcopal throne, he occupied a position which enabled him to discuss, on terms of equality, those important subjects in which Church and State, peer and prelate, have a common interest. He was no more called upon to descend from the episcopal palace to the fisherman's hut, than other members of the House of Lords were required, by the terms of their Christianity, to quit their lordly castles, and to imitate the primitive Christians by selling their property and by laying the proceeds at the feet of the successors of the Apostles. He would carry the humble spirit of the fisherman into the castle, the mansion, or the palace, well knowing that, under the fisherman's cloak, and in his humble abode, the heart of an aristocrat might be perceived to beat by those unseen ministers of God, who have eyes to see and ears to hear what to man is invisible or inaudible.

In all cases, the consistent man will refuse a post wherein there appears to be a conflict of duties which he finds himself unable to reconcile; but, if he accepts the position, he will feel it to be only consistent and seemly to overcome the difficulties on either side, and to exhibit himself, though a dignified ecclesiastic and a peer of the realm, a humble-minded man, who does from a sense of duty what, as a matter of choice, he would avoid. David

when seated on his princely throne, and David when keeping watch, a humble shepherd, over his flock by night, was equally a man after God's own heart. "Many," said Parker, in a letter to Lord Burghley, "are marvelously offended, that bishops are called lords and honourable, and think that those high titles are usurped against God's word, because Christ, answering the contentious ambition of the Apostles, said (Luke xxii.), '*The kings of nations are lords over them, &c., but ye not so.*' Now, if he be called lord which hath the rule and government over his own house; if he be called lord which hath the order over any people or flock, as Joseph was called *lord*, governing the Egyptians under the king; if a poor man, letting his ground or his house but for five shillings a year, is usually called *land-lord*, whereupon deans, parsons, and suchlike are commonly called *lords* of all their tenants, what offence is it if bishops, having lands and lordships, be called *lords*?

"More marvel is it that men cannot abide, that they should be called *honourable*. St. Paul seemeth not to be so precise. '*Let the elders,*' saith he, '*that govern well, be counted worthy double honour.*' Now if it please the king or queen of the realm so to esteem of bishops for their learning, knowledge, and virtue, and to take them among their lords, and account them honourable, and to place them to counsel in parliament or otherwise, it is not to be thought that any offence is committed against God's blessed word so long as the bishops contend not for the same *ambitiously*; and this was the fault which our Saviour Christ reprov'd in his apostles; and also, so long as the bishops contain themselves within their lists—that is, in due obedience and subjection to the high and temporal magistrate. And, finally, for that in these days neither bishop nor archbishop doth take upon him to rule as a king or a prince, or doth usurp the authority of a

CHAP.  
XVI.

Matthew  
Parker.

1559-75.

Parker's  
defence of  
the lordly  
rank of  
bishops.



CHAP.  
XVI.  
Matthew  
Parker.  
1559-75.

king, or taketh upon him tyrannical dominion over his clergy and people committed to his government as the antichristian bishop of Rome most blasphemously doth attempt.

“ Aaron the priest was appointed by God with Moses for the government of God’s people, and was counted in authority not far under Moses. God commanded that kings, for their better government, should peruse the book called Deuteronomium, which they should receive of the priests, who were thought to be had in reverence and authority, for they were the keepers of such mysteries. The prophets, no doubt, were in great authority, and well esteemed with kings and with the people; as Nathan with King David, Elias with King Ahab, Esaias with King Ezekias, and other prophets with the tribe of Judah and with the ten tribes. Elisha was highly esteemed with Naaman of Syria. How honourably did Constantine the Great use the godly bishops in the Council of Nice! How honourably did Theodosius the emperor use Ambrose the Bishop of Milan, though he seemed to use the emperor too severely! But ye will say, Ye read not that any of these were called *lords*. I say, if for their virtues and uprightness in their office, due reverence, authority, and honour were given unto them——”\*

The rest of the MS. from which this letter is taken is wanting. What is here given is a fair specimen of Parker’s composition: we may add the remark, that if we were to establish a sect merely, having for its object the salvation, through preaching, of so many individual souls, the humbler the preacher’s condition may be, so much the better. Many such persons remaining in the humble walks of life have been employed, at all times, by the

\* This is taken from the Petyt MSS., and quoted by Strype, ii. 285.

Catholic Church. But this is not the *sole* object for which the Church was commanded into existence by our blessed Lord. Besides the conversion of souls, the Church is designed to civilize, adorn, and sanctify society at large, and to prepare the world for the second coming of the King of kings and Lord of lords. Besides preachers, therefore, we require rulers and governors and an ecclesiastical as well as temporal aristocracy—princes in the Church as well as dignitaries in the State.

It was under this impression that, as soon as Parker had accepted the primacy, he applied to the herald's office for an addition to his coat-of-arms—if such an addition were not made at the suggestion of the queen herself. By a deed bearing date November 28, 1559, Sir Gilbert Dethick, principal king-at-arms, called garter, added to Parker's paternal coat, on a chevron argent, the three estoils gules. He stated, at the same time, that Parker was a "gentleman of good family bearing arms, and that he was a person that merited, in all places, to be admitted and received into the number and society of illustrious persons; and that for his laudable merits, excellent endowments of mind, and great dexterity in managing affairs, he (the said garter) had given him that addition to his arms."

Parker's conduct, under these circumstances, may be adduced as presenting us with an illustration or example of the principle just advanced. The humility of his mind, while maintaining the dignity of his office, is legible in the motto which he attached to his seal. It was a motto which he often had in his mouth, taken from St. John—"*Mundus transit et concupiscentia ejus*" ("The world passeth away and the lust thereof"). This was engraven round his coat-of-arms; it appeared on his seals; it was inscribed on the walls of his houses, and on the glass of his

CHAP.  
XVI.

Matthew  
Parker.

1559-75.

Addition  
to Parker's  
coat-of-  
arms.

Humility  
of Parker  
attested by  
the motto  
he as-  
sumed.

CHAP.  
XVI.

Matthew  
Parker.

1559-75.

His seal.

His humi-  
lity.

He sus-  
tained the  
"port" of  
a bishop.

windows.\* Thus it was that, in the midst of his worldly greatness, he desired, as he expressed it, to be reminded of his own "brittle and frail condition, and the vanity of the most pompous state." He desired, that his thoughts might rest upon a more stable and lasting inheritance to be possessed in another world. That he might be put in mind of the last judgment, as well as of death, he caused to be engraved on the seal of his see, the appearance of our Lord sitting in his glory, judging the quick and the dead, and saying to his elect "Venite, benedicti," and to the reprobate "Ite, maledicti." Here the dead are represented as rising from their graves to receive the sentence. By these remembrances he sought to quicken himself to do God's will and to discharge his high function; that he might have good hope against the time to come, when God would call him to give an account of his stewardship.

Whatever may be thought of the principle he asserted, it is an act of justice to the man thus to show the real piety and humility of his heart, unknown as all this must have been to his contemporaries, except to his own people. Although a humble man, he felt it to be his duty to maintain what he called "the port of a bishop." It was not for one end only that he was called to his high position, as he himself also would remark; there were many ends to be served when he lived as a prince of the Church. His establishment was certainly on a magnificent scale. Even when he was living in comparative retirement at his favourite residence at Bekesbourne, his household consisted of a hundred persons; and he had left behind him a considerable number of domestics at Lambeth, for whom the accommodation at Bekesbourne was found to be insufficient. For many of those who

\* Matthæus,

attended him, he was indeed obliged to take lodgings; nevertheless, he had within the walls, and receiving wages,—drawers, cutters, painters, limners, writers, and bookbinders, besides the officers of his household and of his courts, his chaplains, and the foreigners with their several suites, whom he was sometimes compelled to entertain.\* For these persons, whether they were with him at Bekesbourne, or whether they were left behind at Lambeth, an establishment was necessarily kept up. The expenses of a college continue even if the master is non-resident. In the year 1563, the queen made a special grant to the archbishop, that, during his life, he might retain in his service, over and above his customary servants, forty persons†—gentlemen or yeomen—to whom, at his pleasure, he might give his livery badge or cognizance.‡ He entertained several skilful engravers, chiefly foreigners, among whom were Hogenbergh and Lyne. They were employed on genealogies and maps. Day, the printer, was for a long time a member of Parker's household. It throws light upon history when we obtain such a list as the following of the officers of his household: steward, treasurer, controller, clerk of the kitchen, caterer, clerk of the spicery, yeomen of the cyry, bakers, pantlers, yeoman of the horse, yeomen ushers, butlers of wine and ale, larderers, squillerys, ushers of the hall, porter, ushers of the chamber, daily waiters of the great chamber, gentleman usher, yeoman of the chamber, carvers, server, cupbearer, grooms of the chamber, marshal, groom ushers, almoner,

CHAP.  
XVI.

Matthew  
Parker.

1559-75.

\* Corresp. p. 426.

† Cardinal Pole had a patent for retaining a hundred servants. The patent is dated August 20, 4 Philip and Mary. *Chartæ Miscellanæ* vi. No. 115, in the library of MSS. at Lambeth.

‡ Corresp. p. 175. Ducarel, p. 35 and 36.



CHAP.  
XVI.Matthew  
Parker.

1559-75.

Order of  
his family.

cooks, chandler, butchers, master of the horse, yeoman of the wardrobe, and harbingers.\*

The management of such an establishment must have been sufficient employment, it might be thought, for many supervisors; but when a routine has once been established, the labour of a superintendent is much diminished. The order of the episcopal dining-room was as follows :—Three tables were spread in the hall. To the archbishop's table none were admitted, under ordinary circumstances, except peers of the realm, privy councillors, and gentlemen of the greatest quality; at the second table the almoner presided, and with him sat the chaplains and all the clergy below the order of diocesan bishops. The third was the steward's table; here sat the suffragan bishops together with all the other gentlemen. The steward, with the servants from gentlemen of better rank, sat at a table at the right hand of the archbishop. The almoner, with the clergy, sat on the opposite side. After dinner the fragments were gathered, and were plentifully distributed to the poor at the gate. Archbishop Parker drew up minute regulations for the observance of his officers; they are so numerous and minute, that to transcribe them would occupy several pages. The steward was directed to be at the larder at eight o'clock in the forenoon, and again at three o'clock in the afternoon; he was to confer with the clerk of the kitchen, "Mr. Cook, and Caterer," as well for the putting forth of the diet to be orderly dressed as also for the providing of more as there should be cause. The usher of the hall was to see that the apartment was kept sweet and clean, and to keep up the fires, which he was to put out at night: he was to ring a bell at six o'clock in the winter, at five in the summer, that all

\* This list is taken from a MS. in the Lambeth library, not numbered, but published by Dr. Ducarel.

persons might rise and pursue their several employments. At eight in the winter, and at seven in the summer, the bell was again to be rung for prayers. These arrangements have been mentioned, to show how minutely the orders were given. We possess also an account of the wages paid to the servants; and it is expressly stated that he gave higher wages than any of his predecessors, and that he increased the wages when any of his people were in want.

CHAP.  
XVI.  
Matthew  
Parker.  
1559-75.

The statement of the general expenses received by the archbishop renders it surprising that he should have been accused of parsimony. When we inquire into the circumstances of the case, our surprise, in the present day, would be in the opposite direction; arising from a different source, and terminating in a very different conclusion. By differing parties he was undoubtedly accused to Sir William Cecil, at one period of his life of extravagance, at another period of penuriousness.

Accused of  
being  
penurious.

Against the charge of penuriousness he vindicated himself most triumphantly during his lifetime; and if a further refutation be required, we possess it in the following document, drawn up by the archbishop's son after his father's death. It is of much interest, as it contains, within a small compass, information respecting the revenues of the see, and the means with which the archbishop was able to perform his many acts of liberality. The paper is entitled—

Contra-  
dicted by  
facts.

“A TRUE ESTATE OF THE ARCHBISHOPRIC OF CANTERBURY IN THE TIME OF ARCHBISHOP PARKER,” and is as follows:—

“The yearly revenue about 3,128*l*. By fines for leases, wardships, *et quo quomodo communibus annis*, 300*l*.; *in toto*, 3,428*l*. The certain yearly disbursements in fees to certain officers, pensions to curates to two hospitals, &c.,

Revenue  
of the see.

CHAP.  
XVI.

Matthew  
Parker.

1559-75.

800*l.*; household achates \* *communibus annis*, 1,300*l.*; wages and liveries to household servants and retainers, 300*l.*: 2,400*l.*

“So is there a *remainder* towards these particular disbursements 1,028*l.*

“He christened, with the queen and Duke of Norfolk, Edvardus Fortunatus, the lady Cecilia her son, and gave about 100*l.*†

“His entertainment of the queen at Canterbury and other houses, with his gifts to her and the lords and ladies, above 2,000*l.*

“At Canterbury he gave besides, in rewards to the queen’s officers of households, 500 crowns—170*l.* His foundation of fellowships and scholarships at Cambridge, yearly sermons, and to the poor of Mattishall for ever, increase of perpetual fees and commons at Bene’t College, had stood him in 2,000*l.*

“The purchase of the soil of the University Street, and buildings on either side, cost him 500*l.* He gave to Glover, alias Somerset, a herald, for a pedigree of the ancient nobility 100*l.*

“He gave to Alexander Neville, for writing the story of Kett’s rebellion, entitled ‘Norwicus,’ 100*l.*‡

“Also a silver and guilt plate to Bene’t College; to Caius College, to Trinity Hall, about 400*l.* He gave to Thomas Doyley, Esq., that married one of his nieces, in money and money worth, 300*l.* To another niece married to Thomas Heth, gentleman, that was worth to their purse (by an advowson) 500*l.* To his niece, named Clerke, &c., 300*l.*

“To Sir Thomas Josseline’s brother, an antiquary in

\* Provisions.

† The Lady Cecilia was a sister of the King of Sweden, and wife of Christopher, Margrave of Baden. The christening alluded to took place in 1565, and will presently be more particularly noticed.

‡ “De Furoribus Norfolciensium Ketto duce.” 4to. Binneman, 1575.

his house, who wrote this history, ‘De Antiquitate Britannicæ Ecclesiæ, a prebend worth 30*l.* per annum, and procured for him 300*l.*

CHAP.  
XVI.

Matthew  
Parker.

1559–75.

“He expended upon repairing of his palace at Canterbury, his chief lodging, being burnt in Archbishop Cranmer’s time, and upon his other houses, chancels, &c., to about 2,600*l.*”\*

In the year 1573, the archbishop, in writing to Lord Burghley in vindication of himself against certain charges brought against him by Thomas Cartwright, his grace makes the following private statement, that the lord treasurer may see how an Archbishop of Canterbury disposed of his income:—

*“Expenses yearly by the Archbishop of Canterbury.”*

First, to the poor.	In certain yearly rent for two hospitals, clx <sup>li</sup> .
	Besides other almose, relief of prisoners, decayed persons, &c.
To ministers, &c.	In certain yearly stipends, ccxxxvij <sup>li</sup> . xiiij <sup>s</sup> . iiij <sup>d</sup> .
	Besides the relief of strangers learned, as T. Cartwright, pag. 98, 89. others.
To scholars and schools.	In foundation of six scholars, xviii <sup>li</sup> ; of two fellows, xij <sup>li</sup> ; yearly for ever, &c. Besides exhibitions to scholars of Cambridge and Oxford, and founding of a grammar-school in Lancashire.
To repair churches and highways.	Reparations of thirteen chancels, of five W. Turner, in his mansion-houses, and certain farms; erecting of an highway in the university of Hunting of the Wolf. Cambridge to the schools.

\* Lambeth MSS., 959, art. 46. The paper is inserted in a copy of Parker’s “Antiquitates,” and published in the preface to the Correspondence.



CHAP.  
XVI.

Matthew  
Parker.  
1559-75.

{ Subsidies, free-rents, new-year's gifts, and  
other such resolute . cccc<sup>li</sup>.  
Annuities and fees . cccc<sup>marks</sup>.  
Liveries, c<sup>li</sup>. Wages, ccl<sup>li</sup>. ccccl<sup>li</sup>.  
Household fare . . . xiiij<sup>c. li</sup>. or xiiij<sup>c. li</sup>.

“Over and beyond—

{ Apparel, armoury, bedding, hangings, linen,  
plate, pewter, books, &c. Physic, jour-  
neying, ferriage, carriage, suits in law,  
christenings, marriages, necessities for  
offices, stable with his furniture, arrear-  
ages, loss of rents, &c.”

Benefac-  
tions to  
his college  
and uni-  
versity.

Although by the list of Parker's benefactions, given by his son, and supplemented from his cheque roll, his liberality is sufficiently attested, yet some further details should not be permitted to pass entirely unnoticed. To his munificence as regards Corpus Christi College, Cambridge, of which he may be regarded as the second founder, we have had occasion in a former chapter to refer; we shall here enlarge upon it.

On June 24, 1567, he purchased an annuity of 10*l.* of the corporation of Norwich, payable out of their manor of Hethill cum Carleton, in Norfolk, which he settled upon the college, thus founding in it three scholarships. He gave the right of nominating to these scholarships to the Mayor and Aldermen of Norwich for the time being. The scholars were to be nominated in writing, out of schools in the city or in the town of Aylsham. They were to be of an age between fourteen and twenty; able to write, sing, and make verse. 8*l.* to be yearly divided among them. Of the remaining forty shillings, thirty were appropriated to a preacher, sent by the college to Thetford, Wymondham, St. Clement's, and the Green-

yard, Norwich,\* and there were certain other minor payments.†

CHAP.  
XVI.

Matthew  
Parker.

1559-75.

In 1569, on May 22, he founded two other scholarships, the scholars to be sent from the free school at Canterbury, and to be called Canterbury Scholars. On the 31st of the same month three more Canterbury scholarships, one from Norfolk, one from Suffolk, and the third from Lincoln; these five scholars were to be nominated by the Dean and Chapter of Canterbury, and were to have chambers on the north side of the quadrangle of Corpus Christi College.

In the same year, August 6, he founded two fellowships and two scholarships more in the same college. These fellows were to be called Norwich Fellows,‡ and to each of these are assigned six pounds per annum, with chambers on the east side of the quadrangle. §

On July 4, 1571, he procured for the college a charter also of mortmain. Through this charter, power was obtained to purchase land to the amount of 100*l.* a year. Parker had previously obtained for the college the advowson of St. Mary Abchurch, London. The plate

\* Le Neve, i. 15.

† To the mayor, *if present* at the sermon at St. Clement's, 1*s.* To the two sheriffs, on the same condition, 1*s.* 4*d.*; and similarly to the curate of St. Clement's, 8*d.*; the town clerk, 6*d.*; the sword-bearer, 6*d.*; the four serjeants-at-mace, 1*s.* 4*d.*; to the parish clerk, 4*d.*; and to the said clerk for looking after the tomb of William Parker and Alice, his wife, set within the churchyard of the parish of St. Clement, 1*s.*; to the poor of the parish, 8*d.*; and to prisoners in the jail, 1*s.* 8*d.*

‡ These were to be elected out of the scholars, within a month after a vacancy, and, in default of such election thus taking place, 6*s.* 8*d.* a week was to be paid to the vice-chancellor, to be distributed amongst the prisoners in the Tolbooth, till it should be completed.

§ As an instance of Parker's attention to minor matters, it may be noted, that he also settled on Corpus Christi College 5*l.* annually, to find a fire in the hall, &c.

CHAP.  
XVI.Matthew  
Parker.  
1559-75.

which he bestowed on this college weighed 326 ounces ; and it must not be omitted that to Caius College and Trinity Hall he also presented plate and books, while at the former he founded a physical and at the latter a law scholarship.

Parker's bounty to the city of Norwich, his native place, was always conspicuous ; and, on one occasion, we find him presenting the corporation, on New Year's Day, with a magnificent gilt basin and ewer. "In acknowledgment of this, and of his many other favours to Norwich, a letter of thanks was sent to the archbishop, and the corporation bound themselves, under a penalty of 100*l.*, never to alienate it but in case of urgent necessity, and then not without the approbation of the masters of Corpus Christi College and of Trinity Hall."

Parkereco-  
nomical.

That Parker was an economist, and that he managed his estates with care and skill, cannot be doubted, and is worthy of praise. By his contemporaries he was said to be "a good husband" of his property. Through the rapacity of the courtiers and reformers of King Edward VI., the estates of the see of Canterbury had been wasted, the property purloined, and the houses left in a dilapidated condition. During the vacancy of the see Elizabeth had a legal claim on the income ; of this she availed herself to the utmost extent, but she did not recognize the responsibility of keeping the estates in good order.

We may feel surprised at the fact, and we must admit that the spoilers were peculiarly rapacious, when we find it stated in the will of Warham, that he had expended thirty thousand pounds in repairing and beautifying his houses.\* It was on this account that he called upon his successor to forbear from any suit for dilapidations against his executors ; but it does not appear how much of that

\* Godwin's Catalogue, in "Archbishop Warham."

sum was expended on the manor-house, or, as it is now called, the Palace of Lambeth. It would appear that Cardinal Pole had commenced repairs at Lambeth upon an extensive scale, but he did not live to complete them. Parker certainly found the house in a ruinous condition. He applied to Pole's executors for dilapidations, and had to institute a suit in order to obtain them; and he succeeded in obtaining, according to one account, the sum of four hundred pounds, or, according to another account, six hundred. He must have expended other sums upon the building; for he boldly asserted in his will that, on account of his large expenditure upon the buildings, his successor ought not to make any demand upon his executors for dilapidations. He repaired the great hall and covered it with shingles; he also made a long bridge, or pier, into the Thames. There was a solar or summer-house in the garden, which the predecessor of Cardinal Pole, Archbishop Cranmer, had erected. This building having fallen into decay, he restored it to its ancient form and beauty. He repaired also two aqueducts for the conveyance of water—one in the garden, the other for the common use of the household. He had also a due regard to sanitary measures, for he made at Lambeth Palace "conveyances underground to cleanse and keep his house sweet, by sinks to carry away the filth into the Thames. 'This cost him no small amount of money, but it tended much to the health of his family. These drains were of brick, arched, and so high that a man might easily walk upright in them.'"

CHAP.  
XVI.

Matthew  
Parker.

1559-75.

His ruin-  
ous build-  
ings.

Drainage  
of Lam-  
beth by  
Parker.

The palace at Canterbury had from time to time been an expense to the several archbishops. It had been pulled down and rebuilt by Archbishop Hubert. After this, additions and alterations were made as they were

\* Ducarel, p. 17.



CHAP.  
XVI.Matthew  
Parker.

1559-75.

Splendid  
hall at  
Canter-  
bury re-  
stored.Repair of  
chancels  
and  
churches.

required, but no reparations had been conducted on a large scale ; it served, however, for the archiepiscopal hospitalities until the episcopate of Archbishop Cranmer, when it suffered so much from fire as to become a perfect ruin. It does not appear that, for the reparation of this edifice, Parker could realize any dilapidations ; but, immediately after his consecration, he took measures for rebuilding it. The people of Canterbury were extremely proud of the splendid hall, in which the archbishops from time to time, and from time immemorial, had been accustomed to entertain the great men of the land, and even kings themselves at some period of their respective reigns. The hall and the various offices attached to it were in a state of such utter ruin and decay, that Parker expended on them and on other houses of the see, during the years of 1560 and 1561, no less a sum than 1,140*l.* 15*s.* 4*d.* With his usual love of method and regularity, he gave an account of the particulars in a book provided for that purpose.\*

Parker had, at the same time, to repair the chancels, and to incur the expenses involved in rectorial rights, of the various churches upon the great tithes of which the archbishop had a claim. In 1568, he restored and beautified the chancel of Bekesbourne church, and he obtained for the vicarage an augmentation of four quarters of wheat, eighteen quarters of barley, and 10*l.* in money yearly.

Having thus, according to scriptural direction, had regard first to the house of his God, he next turned his attention to his own residence in that place. His house at Bekesbourne is described as a small yet elegant residence, very commodious for the archbishop, when he desired to retire from the bustle and turmoil of public life.

\* Somner, p. 101.

Among the advantages of the place, at a time when fish days and fasting days were still observed, this was one, that a river flowed near it, abounding with trout and other fish. Parker was contented with his houses of Lambeth, Croydon, and Bekesbourne; and he was desirous of spending upon Bekesbourne the money which might otherwise be demanded for the rebuilding of the old house of Ford. Ford had been a favourite retreat of Archbishop Cranmer, and, whether on that account, or in the mere spirit of opposition, the Puritans at court, with Leicester at their head, opposed the removal of the archbishop to Bekesbourne. Writing to Cecil, the archbishop said, "I would remove some part of an old, decayed, wasteful, unwholesome, and desolate house at Ford to enlarge the little house I have at Bekesbourne, where, as well for the foreign friend as for the foreign enemy, I would think it needful and requisite to repair my palace with some better lodgings."\*

CHAP.  
XVI.  
Matthew  
Parker.  
1559-75.  
Bekes-  
bourne, his  
private  
residence.

We find him frequently applying to Cecil to obtain the queen's assistance, which, when we remember how she had robbed the archbishopric during the vacancy, he had a right to expect. Although a considerable time elapsed before he could effect his purpose, yet at last his application met with success, and he carried out the work with vigour. While his palace lay a ruin, it was a great convenience to the archbishop to have his country residence within three miles of Canterbury. Le Neve observes, that Parker was nevertheless unable to complete even the work in Bekesbourne, "with the largeness and magnificence his good heart intended."

Parker only repaired that portion of his palace at

\* Corresp. p. 419. See also pp. 446 and 448. This depreciation of Ford is remarkable, as it was the favourite residence of Archbishop Cranmer.

CHAP.  
XVI.Matthew  
Parker.

1559-75.

Lambeth  
House con-  
verted into  
Lambeth  
Palace.

Canterbury, the restoration of which was necessary to enable him to conduct those festivities to which the reader's attention will be presently invited. We may add here, that by succeeding primates, the old palace at Canterbury was permitted to fall so completely into decay, that it was considered expedient in 1658 to pull it down; and from that time, if not before, the title of *palace* was given to the manor-house of Lambeth. This archiepiscopal residence, even in the reign of Charles I., was known by the name of Lambeth House.\*

The people of Canterbury lamented the removal of the palace; or rather the ruinous condition of a building in which at one period they felt a pride; but a building which answered its purposes at a time when the chapter consisted of Benedictines, and when the archbishop presided as abbot, ceased to be a convenient abode, when the primates were selected from the secular clergy, and when many of them were married. How much the memory, however, of Parker lingered round the place, is apparent from the following words of Sir Egerton Brydges, whose paternal acres adjoined the ancient episcopal grounds. Apostrophizing the spirit of Parker, he says, "I bow to thy name with awe and reverence, and record thy written labours with fond admiration. Often as I view the dilapidated abode of thy rural retirement, I imagine the walls to be sanctified by thy former presence; and often as I cross the deserted fields of its domain, now

\* The annotator of Dr. Ducarel states, on the authority of Dr. Ducarel, whose opinion is apparently expressed by the celebrated Henry Wharton, that, in former times, the title of palace was appropriated to the mansion in the city that gave a name to the see. When the old palace, as in the case of Canterbury, was destroyed, one of the other mansions was called the palace. We speak of the Bishop of London's palace at Fulham. See Ducarel's "Lambeth Palace and Lambeth Parish," p. 166.

harassed by the plough and trod only by the uneducated husbandman, I behold again the forms of the associates of learning whom thou once cherishedst there, and people again the surrounding woods and mansions with more cultivated and refined inhabitants."

CHAP.  
XVI.

Matthew  
Parker.  
1559-75.

It will throw light upon the history of the age, and of Parker himself, if we refer to the splendour of his hospitality when, on certain public occasions, the archbishop felt called upon to entertain, not only his clergy, but the gentry of his county, the nobility of the realm, and the queen herself. He had with much reluctance omitted that enthronization feast, in the magnificence of which many of his predecessors had vied with royalty itself. Just after his consecration he had neither time nor money at his disposal. He had much trouble in reclaiming his property; and when he regained his estates he often found them in a ruinous condition. His houses were dilapidated, his woods destroyed, his fields turned into waste land, his deer driven from his parks. When by his wise economy, he found himself, in 1565, in a condition to exercise hospitality, he could not find sufficient game on his estates to supply his table, at a time when a feast without venison would be regarded as we should regard in these days a dinner without beef. He wrote, half in jest, to his friends, entreating them to extricate him from the disgrace he would incur if no game appeared at his table; and, from the series of entertainments he gave at Canterbury, we may infer his success. The great hall, and the palace itself, was patched up for these occasions. The festivities in 1565 were three in number. We have briefly alluded to them when speaking of his visitations, but they may be here more particularly noticed. The first, which lasted three days, began on Whitsunday, and appears to have been a kind of reunion between the eccle-

Parker's  
festivities.

The three  
festivals  
in 1565.



CHAP.  
XVI.

Matthew  
Parker.

1559-75.

siastical and civic authorities of the city. The next was on Trinity Sunday, in celebration of the memory of King Henry VIII.; and the third, more magnificent than any of the rest, was at the assizes. As illustrative of the way in which the archbishop and Mrs. Parker conducted such matters they deserve a separate notice.

Whit-  
sunday.

On Whitsunday, 1565, his grace attended "at his cathedral church to pay God his service." The Holy Communion was administered by the dean, assisted by the cathedral clergy, and the archbishop himself preached the sermon. From the cathedral the primate was conducted by the dean and chapter, and by the mayor and corporation, with a numerous attendance of county gentlemen, to the great hall, which he "had a mind to see filled." Dinner was served, the guests being seated in their due order. It is particularly remarked that, on the right hand of the archbishop, the ladies of rank were seated with Mrs. Parker, and a line of ladies occupied the whole of that side of the hall, corresponding with the row of gentlemen on the other side. This order of placing the ladies was said to be in honour of the queen's majesty. By a queen regnant the ladies of England were brought to an equality with their husbands; and it may be presumed, that this was the first time that this magnificent old hall was honoured by their presence. At the conclusion of this repast, the tables were filled a second time by the members of Parker's household and others, the lesser gentry and yeomen from the country round. On the two following days the festival was continued.\*

\* An account of these festivities is given in Latin, in the "Biography of Matthæus," p. 546; where it is expressly stated, that while the enthronization of many of Parker's predecessors had been celebrated with great festivities, his own had not been so from lack of means. This warming of the hall and palace, five years afterwards, was given in lieu of it.

The second feast, in honour of King Henry VIII., of whom it was said, with an audacity in the art of flattery seldom surpassed, that he was the last restorer and founder of the church of Canterbury, was held on Trinity Sunday, the cathedral of Canterbury having been consecrated to the name of the Holy Trinity. As on the former occasion, the feast was preceded by divine service in the cathedral, with this difference, that "the archbishop himself administered the mystical bread to the people." The feast itself much resembled that which was held on Whitsunday.\*

CHAP.  
XVI.

Matthew  
Parker.

1559-75.

Trinity  
Sunday,  
1565.

July 23,  
1565.

Of the third entertainment, on July 23, which may be termed a legal banquet, we have a more particular description. The guests consisted of the judges who went the circuit, the high sheriffs, with their respective trains, and all who were summoned to the assizes, meaner persons as well as gentlemen. By messengers and officers the archbishop had invited justices of the peace, advocates, and common lawyers, together with the proctors and attorneys. All, it is said, a promiscuous company, came trooping in. Plate of silver and of gold shone forth in the hall, which was hung with tapestry of Flanders. By Parker's domestics only a profusion of dainties was served. As before, new guests supplied the place of those who

\* It will be observed that our first reformers were no Sabbatarians. They looked to the primitive Church for their example. Saturday was called in Puritan times the Sabbath, and in some places, but only in a few, it was kept as a fast. Sunday was everywhere held as the great festival in celebration of the Resurrection. No business was to be undertaken, but all kinds of festivities and innocent amusements were encouraged, provided that public worship, and a participation of the "Banquet of Heavenly Food," in the Eucharist, had first been piously observed. The Puritans converted the festival into a fast without the slightest authority from Scripture, in which the Saturday, not the Sunday, is spoken of as the Sabbath.

CHAP.  
XVI.  
Matthew  
Parker.  
1559-75.

had just been seated at table; and on this occasion it is mentioned, that the ladies and gentlemen were received by Mrs. Parker in an inner parlour, where they were nobly entertained.

The hall was filled with gentlemen only. This arrangement was probably made on account of the crowd; for on other occasions it is expressly stated that it was the archbishop's custom, in honour of matrimony, to entertain the ladies with the gentlemen.

Con-  
strained  
hospitality  
of the  
arch-  
bishop.

Besides the hospitality thus freely exercised, and in which the archbishop and Mrs. Parker were amply repaid for the trouble they took and the money they expended, by the gratitude of persons feasted and the popularity attendant upon those who gave the feast, the archbishop, like other great men in Church and State, was compelled to lessen the public burdens, by becoming sometimes the jailer, as it were, of State prisoners; and at other times the host who, receiving ambassadors from foreign parts, was required, by the exhibition of his splendour, to impress the foreign minds with a notion of England's luxury and wealth.

State pri-  
soners  
committed  
to the cus-  
tody of  
Parker.

There was a certain class of public offenders or defaulters, to prevent whom from escaping to foreign parts was all that was required: they were as men on bail, who were to be forthcoming whenever the crown, or rather the will of our sovereign lady the queen, required their appearance at the bar of justice. The demand upon the nobles and the more wealthy of the grandees was, that the persons committed to their custody should be supplied, not, as in the case of foreign ambassadors, with the luxuries of life, but merely with board and lodging—the necessities of life.

We have already had occasion to mention, that Parker was obliged to act in the capacity of jailer to certain of

the suffragans of his province ; who refused to sanction the Reformation, or conform to the regulations of their Church, as conducted and enforced by the civil and ecclesiastical authorities during the early part of Queen Elizabeth's reign.

CHAP.  
XVI.

Matthew  
Parker.  
1559-75.

The consideration, kindness, and marked humanity evinced by Parker in all his dealings with these distinguished and unfortunate personages, may be fairly produced as telling in his favour, and as proving him to be—what he really was—a kind-hearted man. And the praise which is due to him must be shared by Elizabeth and her government, and the more so when we call to mind the rude and heartless manner in which the laws against heresy were enforced by such coarse-minded men as Bonner, in the reign of Queen Mary.

Among the ecclesiastics committed to Parker's custody must be especially noticed Cuthbert Tunstall, ex-Bishop of Durham ; Thomas Thirlby, formerly Bishop of Ely ; Dr. Boxall, and Dr. Richard Smith.

Cuthbert  
Tunstall.

For Bishop Tunstall, a good but weak man, who had conducted himself with marked moderation in Queen Mary's reign, no persecution having been permitted in his diocese, Elizabeth at heart entertained a friendly feeling ; and she fully expected that he would, in course of time, conform to the Reformation of the Church. This feeling was expressed when the Lords of the Council committed him to the custody of Parker by the following letter, dated September 27, 1559 :—

“May the advice of Mr. Almoner have sent unto you the Bishop of Durham, desiring you to appoint a fit chamber for him, and for one man to attend him in your house, near unto you, so that (at times seeming to you most convenient) you may have conference with him on certain points of religion, wherein he is to be resolved.



CHAP.  
XVI.Matthew  
Parker.

1559-75.

And, during the time he shall remain with you, to have a vigilant eye that no man have access unto him but yourself and such as you shall appoint; and that he have meat, drink, and all things necessary as to him appertain."

Of Cuthbert Tunstall, at that time in his eighty-fifth year, Matthæus himself has this encomium: "Quo nemo omni disciplinarum genere doctior, aut in jure civili pontificioque peritior, aut in civili administratione prudentior in Anglia fuit." He had been vicar-general *in spiritualibus* to Archbishop Warham, by whom he was brought under the notice of Henry VIII., and became one of the most distinguished men of his time. Parker entered frequently into conversation with him, during the few months of his detention at Lambeth; and it is mentioned that, before his death, which occurred suddenly in the following November, he was, by the archbishop's means, "brought off from papistical fancies;"\* and that he had declared it his judgment that the Pope's too far distended power ought to be restrained within his own diocese of Rome. Tunstall, it appears, had written learnedly to this effect to Cardinal Pole when he was an exile in Italy,† and fourteen days before his death he mentioned this circumstance to Parker, and also his opinion of the lawfulness of the marriage of priests, declaring also that his judgment with respect to justification was in accordance with that of the Reformers. Parker wrote to Cecil, informing him of Tunstall's death, and that it had been the bishop's mind "to be homely and plainly buried;" and he was accordingly interred "under a fair stone, with an inscription in brass, in the parish church of Lambeth."

\* Strype, i. p. 94.

† Matthæus, p. 552.

Thirlby and Boxall\* were subjected to the same mild treatment, and were allowed considerably more liberty. The latter had been sent by Sir Thomas Parry and Sir William Cecil to Parker on the 2nd of November, 1559, to see whether he would take the oath of conformity, and, with others who refused to do so, he was committed to the Tower. In the September of the following year, the archbishop wrote considerably to Sir Edward Warner, the Lieutenant of the Tower, for the express purpose of mitigating the severity of their confinement. The letter runs thus: "Upon my late advertisement, sent to certain of the council, concerning the further liberty of the prisoners, and for their most comfort to be associated together, ye shall understand that they have addressed their letters of answer again to me, referring the order partly to my consideration. Whereupon, if ye do conjoin at one table together, Mr. Doctor Heath, Dr. Pates, Dr. Beckenham, Dr. Boxall, to be of one society, and Mr. Dr. Thirlby, Dr. Bourne, Dr. Watson, and Dr. Turberville of the other, I think as this combination prescribed will not offend them, and, as I trust, may be done without inconvenience, so it may be your warrant."† Thirlby and Boxall continued within the walls of the Tower during three years, when, to guard them from the infection of the plague, which was rife in London and its neighbourhood, ‡ the Lords of the Council, in September, 1563, wrote to the archbishop, soliciting him that he would receive them into his own house. Dr. Thirlby, at the same time, addressed a letter to the archbishop, which began thus:

CHAP.  
XVI.

Matthew  
Parker.

1559-75.

Dr. Boxall.

Thomas  
Thirlby.

\* Dr. Boxall, who had been Secretary of State and one of the Privy Council in Mary's reign, is described as "a man of a mild and amiable disposition, who had abstained from all participation in the Marian persecution." Matthæus.

† Corresp. p. 122.

‡ Ibid. p. 192.

CHAP.  
XVI.

Matthew  
Parker.

1559-75.

“Your grace knoweth the proverb, ‘An unbidden guest knoweth not where to sit.’ Although we be unbidden, yet we are not unappointed. Mr. Boxall and I be assigned to remain with your grace, how long, or in what condition, I think you shall know by the Lords of the Council’s letter, which our keepers will bring with us.” He then desires to bring with him his man and boy, and mentions the danger of infection which they will incur on their journey. Parker’s reply was, “Sir, As an unbidden guest, as ye write, knoweth not where to sit, so a guest, bidden or unbidden, being content with that which he shall find, shall deserve to be the better welcome. If ye bring with you your man and your young querister too, ye shall not be refused, and if your companion in journey can content himself with one man to attend upon him, your lodgings shall the sooner be prepared. Your best way were to Maidstone the first night, and the next hither. I would wish your coming were the sooner before night, that such as shall come with you, being once discharged of their charge, may return that night to Canterbury, two miles off, to their bed. And thus God send you a quiet passage. The 20th of September, 1563.”

Parker shortly after sent word to Cecil, that he had placed them in a kind of quarantine, in a house void of a dweller, till such time as they were blown with the fresh air for fourteen days. At Bekesbourne and Lambeth, Thirlby and Boxall henceforth lived with Parker, and for several years were inmates of his family. Several references to them occur in the archbishop’s letters; they both died in his custody, and the former was buried at Lambeth, near Bishop Tunstall’s grave.

Dr.  
Richard  
Smith.

Dr. Richard Smith and Dr. Tresham were also placed under Parker’s charge by the queen. It is said of Smith, that he was persuaded not only to conform, but,

as he said, to "subscribe gladly." Such, too, was the case with Dr. Tresham; he also conformed and was restored to liberty.

CHAP.  
XVI.

Matthew  
Parker.

1559-75.

We are not to suppose, that Parker had the custody only of ecclesiastics. State prisoners were assigned to him as well as to others among the great men of the country, laymen as well as clergymen. But, with a view to their conversion, the persons sent to the archbishop were generally persons whose discontent with the reformation of the Church was beginning to display itself in disloyalty to the queen.

Among these prisoners for conscience' sake thus intrusted to Parker's lenient charge were Lord Henry Howard and Lord Stourton. Their cases too exemplify both the archbishop's considerateness and painstaking, and shall be briefly laid before the reader.

Lord  
Henry  
Howard.

On the 2nd of June, 1572, the Duke of Norfolk was beheaded, and his brother, Lord Henry Howard, was at this time committed to Parker's custody. Lord Henry had been a diligent student at Cambridge, and had acquired reputation by his wit and learning. The primate treated him with respect and courtesy, and, knowing how especially irksome confinement must be to such a stirring spirit, he did his best to obtain his release. In the very month after his committal Parker wrote to Cecil, just created Lord Burghley, a short letter, in which he backed Lord Henry's solicitation; and urged Cecil's intercession with the queen in his favour. To this application of Parker, Lord Henry Howard doubtless mainly owed his restoration to freedom.

The case of John Lord Stourton is still more to the point. He was the son of Charles Lord Stourton, upon whom Queen Mary permitted the law to take its course in all its severity, by way of example. He had been

Lord  
Stourton.



CHAP.  
XVI.Matthew  
Parker.

1559-75.

guilty of a barbarous murder, and expected to escape the punishment due to his offence in the reign of Mary, by counterfeiting a zeal for "the Bishop of Rome" and those enormities which created Protestant truth, as if the religion of a murderer, except in regard to repentance, was worth a moment's thought. His son was apprehended in an attempt to leave England, at a time when especial care was taken to prevent communication with the King of Spain. A clandestine flight from the country was sure to excite strong suspicions "against the runagate." Lord Stourton, on his apprehension, was informed that he had incurred the heavy displeasure of Queen Elizabeth, and, in April, 1573, he was committed to Parker's custody at Lambeth. The archbishop admitted him to his table, and conversed with him freely. Although he found him ignorant and bigoted, Parker promised to write to the queen in his behalf; and, by degrees, he brought him to attend the daily prayers in his chapel with the household. On the 25th, Parker wrote to Lord Burghley, that he had "good trust in his nature, and that he thought it pity to quench the smoking flax, for he saw," as he termed it, "honesty in him;" and two days after he petitioned the queen in Lord Stourton's favour. Queen Elizabeth, however, was not to be at once persuaded. During the summer the young lord remained under the archbishop's roof at Lambeth; but Parker's kind intercessions at last prevailed, and in the following November his release was effected.

List of  
State pri-  
soners.

In the Addenda to the "Calendar of Domestic State Papers" lately brought to light, and ably edited by Mrs. Green, there is a schedule signed by the Bishops of London, Ely, and Chester; in which we possess a curious list of State prisoners, with their respective characters, and an account of the precise limits of their con-

finement. These limits were generally very extensive, and are fixed by a radius of a certain number of miles from a central position. The list, which occupies several pages, is drawn up in columns, and is too long for transcription in this place. We may, however, give a few specimens. The first name that occurs is that of Alexander Beesar, who is described as "old, wealthy, and stubborn." He was not to move beyond two miles from Hanbury, in the county of Oxford. Poole, late Bishop of Peterborough, is spoken of as "a man well known, and reported to live quietly, and therefore hitherto tolerated." Thomas Wil-lanton, late chaplain to Dr. Bonner, was "stiff and not unlearned." He might range over the counties of Middlesex and Bucks, or, at his option, confine himself to the city of London. Anthony Atkins, clerk, late of Oxford, was confined to the counties of Gloucester and Salop, being "an unlearned priest, very wilful." Edmund Daniell, late Dean of Hereford, was to be the prisoner of the lord treasurer, or within twelve miles of his abode: he could not have been a pleasant companion, being "one that pretends a sobriety, but yet is stubborn." We find another person, Stephen Hopkins by name, confessor to the Bishop of Aquila, taken out of the Fleet by the queen's command, and consigned to the custody of the Bishop of Canterbury. His character is not given.\*

CHAP.  
XVI.

Matthew  
Parker.

1559-75.

Limits of  
their con-  
finement.

To the prisoners in his house the archbishop was bound to assign separate lodgings, with chambers, together with their attendants, with fuel for their fires and candles for their chambers. When the archbishop dined in the public hall, instead of privately with his family, all persons committed to his custody were accustomed to dine with him, and to be treated with great respect. It is par-

\* Calendars of State Papers, with Addenda, 1547-65, preserved in Her Majesty's Public Record Office, p. 521.

CHAP.  
XVI.Matthew  
Parker.  
1559-75.

ticularly mentioned, that no allowance was made from the queen or from themselves—the only remuneration he received, was that at their deaths he accepted a donation of books from their libraries.

He complained frequently, as we see in the Calendars of State Papers and in his correspondence, of having to entertain foreign ambassadors and their suites. We may suppose, that the courtiers, using their influence with the queen, endeavoured to force upon him more than his share of this burden. As an instance of the difficulties which he had to incur, the following will be an illustration. On the 24th of May, 1564, the queen wrote to Parker, “that an ambassador whom the French king sendeth to us, named Monsieur de Gonor, of his privy council and order, should be well received and conducted to us, &c. . . . We will that he should be received by you at Canterbury, or, if it shall be thought meet, at your house at Bekesbourne, and there lodged. . . . Wherefore we require you to have consideration thereof, and to use the said ambassador with all courtesy meet for the place that he holdeth; not meaning thereby that you should neglect the place you hold in our Church, nor that you should receive him but at the entry of your church or house,” &c.\*

French  
ambas-  
sador en-  
tertained  
by Parker.

This introduction appears to have terminated agreeably to Parker. On the 3rd of June, he wrote a description of his reception of Monsieur de Gonor;† and this letter is so interesting, that I shall make from it copious extracts. Of Monsieur de Gonor he speaks as a man of “gentle nature;” and he observed, that he was attended by young gentlemen who made observations, not only on the country, but also on the proceedings of the State, especially on what related to religion. “He

Inter-  
view be-  
tween  
Parker and  
the French  
ambas-  
sador.

\* Corresp. p. 212.

† Ibid. p. 214.

coming unto me on Friday, by two of the clock, and therefore having the longer day to spend, to give him some occasion of conference after his reposing in his chamber, I walked in my garden under the sight of his eye, as talking familiarly with my neighbours, the gentlemen of the county. He shortly after came down unto us in the garden, and brought especially with him the Bishop of Constance, as interpreter betwixt us, who appeareth to be a good, soft-natured gentleman. The substance of his inquisition was much for the order and using of our religion, the particularities whereof I discoursed unto him. He noticed much and delighted in our mediocrity (moderation), charging the medians, or Scottish, as going too far in extremities.

“ I perceived that they thought before their coming we had neither *statas preces* nor choice of days of abstinence, as Lent, &c., nor *orders ecclesiastical*, nor persons of our profession in any regard or estimation, or of any ability, amongst us. And thereupon, partly by word and partly by some little superfluity of fare and provision, I did beat that plainly out of their heads. And so they seemed to be glad that, in ministration of our common prayer and sacraments, we use such reverent mediocrity, and that we did not expel music out of our choir, telling them that our music drowned not the principal regard of our prayer. . . .

“ They have also understanding of my prisoners here, and I noted to them the queen’s clemency and mercy towards them for the preservation of them from the plague, and for the distribution of them among their friends. They seemed to be grieved that they were so stiff not to follow the prince’s religion. I do smell by them that the young gentlemen were well advertised to see to their behaviour within the realm. For understanding immediately upon their departure by mine

CHAP.  
XVI.

Matthew  
Parker.  
1559-75.



CHAP.  
XVI.Matthew  
Parker.

1559-75.

officers of their behaviour, I could not charge them either by word or deed, or purloining the worth of one silver spoon : somewhat otherwise than I did doubt of before.

“ As I perceived them to be curious and inquisitive, so I appointed some of mine own to be as inquisitive with them, to understand their state in the country. Some of them were frank to note much more misery reigning amongst them than was commonly known abroad with us. And because they much noted the tract of this country in the fair plains and downs so nigh the sea, and to mark the strength we were of, in a little vain brag (unpriestly, ye may say) I thought good to have a piece of mine armoury in a lower chamber nigh to my court subject to their eyes ; whereby they did see that some preparation we had against their invasion, if it had been so purposed. And so they talked, as I learnt by them that were their companions.

“ For the days of our abstinence I informed them that we were more religious in that point than they be ; and, though I made them a fish supper on Friday night, I caused them to understand that it was rather in respect of their usage at home than for that we used so the Friday or any other such fasting days, which we observe partly in respect of temperance and part for policy, not for any scrupulosity in choice of days. I signified unto them that we had both bishops and priests, married and not married, every man at his liberty, with some prudent caution provided for their sober contracting and conversation afterwards : they did not disallow thereof.

*In fine, they professed that in religion we were very nigh to them.* I answered that I would wish them to come nigher to us, grounding ourselves (as we do) upon the apostolical doctrine and pure time of the primitive Church.

Fasting to  
our Catho-  
lics, with  
French  
notions of  
the word.

They were contented to hear evil of the pope, and bragged how stout they had been aforetimes against that authority. But I said our proceedings here in England always were not in words, as in Edward the Third's days, and as the pope could never win again at our hands that then he lost in open field concerning provisions, &c.

"Sir, the ground of their repair hither I know not certainly, but it may be that this ambassador may be a great stay in his own country for the better supposing of us hereafter; what thereof may follow must be left to God. This bishop showed me that he meant to present unto the queen's majesty Hieronimus Osorius' epistle,\* translated and printed by his procurement (as he said) into French. I asked what was his meaning. He answered, because it expressed so well the queen's majesty's graces and gifts, &c. I told him that I thought the queen could take more pleasure to read it well in Latin than in French, and that so he might have better gratified the queen's highness with causing Mr. Haddon's answer thereto to be translated, for oft copying thereof could be no pleasure to the queen's majesty, the matter being so bad. He had not heard of any answer thereto, and therefore I gave him a book for the ambassador and him to read by the way. If ye dislike the bishop's intendment, ye may dissuade him.

"Ye may think that I am either vainly idle or that I think you have too much spare time thus to trouble you. But I commit altogether unto your gentle consideration to gather of these things as ye think good. And, thus avoiding further discourse, I commit you to God as myself.

\* The epistle of Hieronymus Osorius, Bishop of Silvas, in Algarve, was a Latin letter addressed to Queen Elizabeth, with a view to her conversion to Romanism. Some statements in it were so offensive, that Haddon was encouraged, if not employed, to publish an answer. Osorius replied, and Haddon's rejoinder, left imperfect at his death, was finished by Foxe, the martyrologist.

CHAP.  
XVI.  
Matthew  
Parker.  
1559-75.

"\*The grief of a distempered head made me to indite my writing, as ye see. I would fain know what is meant or determined concerning my two guests sent to me, because I intend, God willing, now shortly to repair to Lambeth.

"This country is very dear to dwell in. This third of June. From my house at Bekesbourne.

"Your Honour's always,

"MATTHUE CANT.

"To the Right Honourable Sir William Cecil, Knight,  
Principal Secretary to the Queen's Majesty, and  
of the Privy Council at the Court."

Domestic  
arrange-  
ments.

Through these circumstances—his having to act as the jailer to some of the State prisoners, and as the host occasionally to foreign ambassadors, and to other grandees who claimed the hospitality of the country, an inroad was made upon the domestic comfort of the archbishop. He was obliged to maintain a private establishment, both at Lambeth and Bekesbourne, for his wife. It would not have been seemly, according to the opinions of the age, for her to make her appearance daily in the public hall; nevertheless, like a good wife, she was anxious to see her husband filling the high station he was called upon to occupy in all the magnificence which such a station demands. It might have been expected that, with her large family, she would call upon the archbishop to save a private fortune for his children; but, instead of this, she aided the archbishop by her wise counsels, and by uniting with him in contriving to render his establishment decorous and at the same time magnificent. In the expenses incurred in the restoration of his buildings, and in those festivities which have just been described, the

\* This concluding paragraph was written by Parker's own hand.

archbishop was deeply indebted both to her good taste and to her skill in management.

CHAP.  
XVI.

Matthew  
Parker.

1559-75.

Her tastes, as might be expected, accorded with those of her husband, and it was in the privacy of domestic life that they both found their real enjoyment. In her private apartments they were surrounded by their family; and when her children grew up she provided a home for them and for her grandchildren. Although, after a time, it was necessary that her two sons should have homes of their own, yet when they were first married, her eldest son, John, and her second son, Matthew, each with a man-servant and a woman-servant, were treated in their father's house as if it was their own home. Here, too, the archbishop's half-brother, Baker, with his wife and daughter, and his niece, named Clerke, with her son, were long and frequently residents. Each came with a man-servant and a maid-servant besides other attendants, making an addition to the family, when the family party was assembled, of sixteen persons. She liked to gather around her friends in every class of life, her chief friend being the Countess of Shrewsbury.\*

John and  
Matthew  
Parker.

Here also she received occasional visits from the queen. A gossiping story is told by Sir John Harrington in his "*Nugæ Antiquæ*" to this effect, that, in parting, on one occasion, with Mrs. Parker, after having expressed her thanks to the archbishop, the queen turned round to his wife, and said, "And you—*madam* I may not call you, and *mistress* I am ashamed to call you—but yet I do thank you."† The whole point of the story

Reputed  
insolence  
of the  
queen.

\* In the Lambeth Library there is an English psalter, printed by John Day, a printer who resided in the house with Archbishop Parker, with the following memorandum on the back of the title-page: "To the right virtuous and honourable Lady Shrewsbury, from your loving friend, Margaret Parker."

† "*Nugæ Antiquæ*," ii. 16.



CHAP.  
XVI.Matthew  
Parker.

1559-75.

depends on the manner in which the sentence was uttered. Illustrious personages are often damaged in their character, by dry historians relating in seriousness, what was originally said in jest. It is not to be supposed, that Queen Elizabeth would have the bad feeling and bad taste to utter such a speech as this to insult a lady of birth and education, after having partaken of her hospitality and been gratified by her attention. That the jest was a bad one, and such as, in the present day, would not be tolerated in good society, we may admit. But we can account for it, for when permission was given to the clergy to marry, the question naturally arose as to the position to be assigned to their wives—a point which was never settled. This was more felt in the sixteenth century than afterwards. Before the Reformation the clergy frequently married, but they were generally obliged to select their wives from the humbler classes of society: since the Reformation the wives of the clergy, having been selected by the better educated clergy from the upper and middle classes of society, have a position by courtesy assigned to them among the first ladies of the land; but even now they have not legal precedence accorded to them, and what their precedence was to be was no doubt frequently discussed in Queen Elizabeth's court. We may understand the queen's speech to mean, "I thank you for having received me with all the good taste of a lady, such as you are, although I know not what is now your legal address." From the queen's well-known desire to enforce the celibacy of the clergy, she went out of her way to suggest, that a lady's social position was not to be advanced by her relation to the first lord of parliament.

We may take this opportunity of observing, that a similar historical mistake has been made by the misunder-

standing, on the part of some historians, of a speech addressed by the queen to Dean Noel. The dean had presented to the queen a Prayer-Book illustrated with engravings: the Puritans have inferred, from her anger on the occasion, that to the use of pictures and statues in religion Elizabeth was opposed. The fact really is, that the Puritan bishops, at that time, had tormented the queen by entreating her to discard the crucifix and certain images from her chapel. Although Parker defended their use, even he had the weakness to join with this party on this occasion; and the queen, who hated Puritanism, was extremely angry. Among the persons who pestered the queen on the subject, she knew Dean Noel to be one. He thought to please her by presenting her with a picture-book—the same objection which existed towards images had not been extended towards pictures; but Elizabeth's more logical mind saw at once the absurdity of thinking that pictures might be lawful, but that a crucifix must be Nehushtan. The indignation she felt on the subject of images, for the expulsion of which from her chapel she was urged by the Puritans, flared out in rebuke of the iconoclast dean; whose fault in her eyes was, not that of wrong principle, but merely that of bad logic, and of an inconsistency which was to her insulting.

In regard to the queen's conduct towards Parker, I think that more has been said of her neglect or insolence than can really be substantiated, if we take all things into consideration. Parker himself was tetchy; and though his feelings towards the queen were paternal, such as those of Lord Melbourne towards our most gracious and beloved sovereign lady, Queen Victoria, in her girlhood, yet there was in his affection a touch of jealousy. Elizabeth was, like her father, selfish—regardless of the feelings

CHAP.  
XVI.

Matthew  
Parker.

1559-75.

The  
queen's  
rebuke of  
Dean Noel.

CHAP.  
XVI.Matthew  
Parker.  
1559-75.

or interests of others, when anything occurred which rendered her oblivious of absent offending friends. But we have found her always anxious to show that respect to the primate which many of her courtiers, hungering and thirsting after the property of the Church, and forgetting that property "purchased by rapine is more than stealth," would fain have withheld. Among the many proofs which the queen gave of her determination to recognize, and compel her courtiers to recognize, the high station of the archbishop, and the honour due to the first lord of her parliament, was her inviting Parker to act with herself at a royal baptism.

Arch-  
bishop  
sponsor to  
the child  
of the  
Margrave  
of Baden.

Cecilia, sister of the King of Sweden, and wife of Christopher, Margrave of Baden, gave birth to a child while she was on a visit to the English court. Elizabeth was herself to be one of the sponsors at the christening, and she selected, to share that honour with her, the first lord spiritual and the first lord temporal of her realm—Matthew, Archbishop of Canterbury, and Thomas Duke of Norfolk. The child was baptized in her own chapel, and was named by her majesty Edvardus Fortunatus.

Connected with the baptism of the child of the Margrave of Baden, we may mention that the christening party were invited to receive the Holy Communion with the queen on the following Christmas Day.

Arch-  
bishop re-  
ceives the  
Communion  
with  
the queen.

On Christmas Eve the queen's majesty attended evening prayer in her chapel at Whitehall in state; the sword of state was borne before her by the Earl of Warwick, and her train was supported by the Lady Strange. On the Christmas Day her majesty appeared in a gown of purple velvet, embroidered with silver, and richly set with precious stones. She wore the collar of the Garter, studded with jewels. The same noble lord again carried before her the sword of state, and Lady Strange officiated in bearing



her train. The queen took her seat in a traverse, where she remained till the rehearsal of the Nicene Creed. When the offertory was to be made, the queen's majesty, preceded by a gentleman usher and the lord chamberlain, knelt before the altar, and the offering being given to her by the Marchioness of Northampton, she presented it in the usual form. After this, she returned to her traverse, and there remained until the time of the Communion: she then came down, and knelt on a cushion prepared for her. We are told, that the gentlemen ushers delivered the towel to the lord chamberlain: he delivered it to be holden by the Earl of Sussex on the right hand, and by the Earl of Leicester on the left hand. The Bishop of Rochester administered the Sacrament to the queen in both kinds: she then returned to her traverse. The Lady Cecilia, wife of the Margrave of Baden, then came down from the traverse, and knelt where the queen had knelt before. After this his grace the Archbishop of Canterbury and the lord chamberlain received the Communion with the mother of the maids.

The queen, we are told, did not enter the closet, but returned to the chamber of presence. Her majesty did not on that day dine abroad; but the officers of arms had a mess of meat of seven dishes, with bread, beer, ale, and wine.\*

The archbishop appears to have been in favour at this time, for he received the following letter from Dudley:—"My Lord,—The Queen's Majestie being abroad hunting yesterday in the forrest, and having had very good hap, besides great sport, she hath thought good to remember your grace with part of her prey, and so commanded me to send you from her highness a great and fat stag,

CHAP.  
XVI.

Matthew  
Parker.  
1559-75.

Present of  
game from  
the queen.

\* This account is taken by Nichols from a MS. in the British Museum.



CHAP.  
XVI.

Matthew  
Parker.

1559-75.

killed by her own hands, which, because the weather was hot, and the deer somewhat chafed, and dangerous to be carried so far without some help, I caused him to be purloyned in this sort, for the better preservation of him, which I doubt not but shall cause him to come unto you as I would be glad he should. So having no other matter at present to trouble your grace withall, I will commit you to the Almighty, and with my most hearty commendations take my leave. In haste, at Windsor, this third of September.

“Your Grace assured,

“R. DUDLEY.”

Archbishop Parker was well aware that the queen's name was to him a tower of strength in the various controversies which were forced upon him ; and the queen was equally aware that, if she meant to carry out her principle of reforming the old Catholic Church, and not of supplanting it by a new Protestant sect, she must uphold the dignity and maintain the authority of the Primate of all England. So early as the 29th of July, 1560, when Parker was so poor that he could not give the enthronization feast, when the rents of his estates had not yet been paid, the queen was so anxious to do him honour, that when, in her progress to Greenwich by land, she came to Lambeth, she there, with her Privy Council, offered to dine with my “Lord of Canterbury.” From a letter from Parker to Lord Bacon, it would appear that, contrary to her usual custom, she actually paid the expenses of the entertainment. Her conscience, no doubt, reproached her for being the cause of the archbishop's poverty at this time. During the vacancy of the see, there is no doubt but that she had seized, as the law then permitted her, upon the property, and allowed the estates to be so

Royal  
visit. July  
29, 1560.

mismanaged, that it required all Parker's economical habits to render them as productive as they soon became.

She was careful, however, that conduct which would have been the extreme of injustice not, on this occasion, to have adopted, should not be used to establish a precedent; for by her royal progresses she effected many purposes: she conferred an honour on her nobility, and, when so doing, compelled them to pay all the expenses of her court and household for several months. While she impoverished the aristocracy, and so obtained power over them, she caused money to be freely circulated among the poor; and no music was sweeter to her ears than a hearty English cheer.

Returning to the consideration of Parker's domestic arrangements, we have the authority of one of the members of his household, Dr. Ackworth, for stating the wonderful regularity with which the affairs of so large a family were conducted. But what struck him still more than anything else, was the visible effect tacitly produced by the example and conversation of Parker upon all his servants and dependents. As in Wolsey's time, the sons of the nobility sought, or their parents sought for them, admittance, as if it were a college, into the archbishop's palace. In addition to these were the artists and others, who, while labouring for Parker, gave instruction to the younger members of the household. From the highest to the lowest, from the young lordling to the menial servant, Parker extended his friendship, and instructed them both by lectures in his chapel, and by a bright example in the daily walks of life.

Twice a day the whole family assembled in the chapel for matins and for evensong; and there the archbishop was always seen, except when he was confined to his room by illness. When the plea of business was urged, he

CHAP.  
XVI.

Matthew  
Parker.

1559-75.

Young  
noblemen  
members  
of his  
household.

CHAP.  
XVI.

Matthew  
Parker.

1559-75.

His  
chaplains.

His table.

Provision  
for his  
wife.

Difficulties  
attending  
the free-  
dom to  
marry won  
by the  
clergy.

turned a deaf ear to the temptation, saying, that no business can be considered of more importance than that of attendance upon the King of kings and Lord of lords.

He was especially careful to treat his chaplains as gentlemen, and to exclude them from all secular employments. They were required to devote their time to study, to preaching, and to prayer. His table was so plentifully supplied, that it was observed that all who arrived at the palace, "not above the degree of a knight, might be entertained worthy of his quality at the steward's or almoner's table." He himself ate sparingly, and drank scarcely any wine. His ordinary dress was that of a clergyman. Like many other persons who are reserved, shy, and awkward in general society, he was, when unrestrained, inclined to be facetious, and had the faculty of setting his company at their ease.

The archbishop was devoted, as he well might be, to one in whose sweet counsels he found comfort and support. He had not expected to survive his wife; and for her future support he made provision: he purchased a house at Bekesbourne, and with his own money he bought another at Lambeth, which, having been formerly the abode of the Duke of Norfolk, was called Norfolk House. These he settled on his wife during her lifetime, making provision that at her death, these houses, together with St. Mary's Hostle at Cambridge, of which he had made her joint-purchaser with himself, should descend to their sons, John and Matthew. In making this settlement he acted with his usual precaution. Before the Reformation the law enforcing the celibacy of the clergy had been often evaded by secret marriages. But as these alliances were looked down upon, and the dignified clergyman could not raise his wife to an equality with himself, it was seldom that he could obtain the affections of a lady of

the upper class of society. The legality of the marriage and the legitimacy of the children might be disputed; and the cruel position in which a lady by birth and education, as Mrs. Parker was, might be left through the obstinacy of the queen, determined the archbishop to have his children "legitimated, that they might have a right to inherit." He thought, that a question might be raised whether Mrs. Parker's brother was her heir. The whole transaction was probably a work of supererogation; for Samuel Harleston, his brother-in-law, gave him no trouble, but readily met all his wishes. The subject of clerical marriage was entirely set at rest in the beginning of the reign of James I.

CHAP.  
XVI.

Matthew  
Parker.

1559-75.

Of the archbishop's four sons, two died in their infancy. John and Matthew, educated at home, and then sent to Cambridge, married and became family men, though Matthew died before his father. One of Archbishop Parker's great faults was, that he despaired of the fortunes of his Church. He determined to save all he could, but he perceived, that puritanism was gaining ground on all sides, partly by the zeal of the Puritans and partly by the misconduct of the papists, who, coming from abroad, gave utterance to the sentiments of assassins, and threatened the queen's life. Both sides were united, the one consciously, and the other through inadvertence, in preventing the reform of the old Catholic Church and in trying to force a Protestant sect into its place. He may have been prepared himself, if need should be, to lay down his life for his principles, but he did not detect the spirit of a martyr in either of his sons, and he did not choose to force upon them the alternative of renouncing their principles or submitting to a cruel death. He provided for them modestly, by appointing them to certain lay offices connected with the see of Canterbury. For

Provision  
for his  
children.



CHAP.  
XVI.Matthew  
Parker.

1559-75.

John  
Parker.John  
Parker's  
poverty.

John Parker, his eldest son, he purchased an estate in Somersetshire; the estate of Bexley, in the county of Kent, he gave to his second son, Matthew. It passed on Matthew's death, into John's family. His eldest son, John, was knighted by King James I. on the king's arrival at Westminster in 1603, at a time when knighthood was considered a high distinction. John Parker seems to have resided chiefly at Bekesbourne till the year 1590, after which time, according to Masters, he took up his abode at St. Mary's Hostle, in Cambridge. Although Strype says, that Sir John Parker had "a plentiful provision from his father," he certainly did not die a rich man. During his residence in Cambridge he was treated with marked respect, and became, in Masters' words, a "privileged person." What that designation implies it is not easy to say, but that he had a certificate to this purport from Dr. Duport, vice-chancellor, in 1595, documents still exist to show. He proceeded at the same time Master of Arts. These circumstances are mentioned, that we may not suppose him to have been guilty of any misconduct, unless we regard in that point of view the mismanagement of the landed property he inherited, for he certainly was so reduced to poverty, "*Inopiâ jam tam gravi laboranti*,"\* that he was buried at the expense of the college. Their respect was still further shown by their causing the funeral to take place at Great St. Mary's Church. A short time before, they had lent to Richard, the son of Sir John, the sum of 10*l.*, out of great regard for his grandfather, "with this very handsome condition, that if he should never be able to repay them, it should be returned to the college chest *per providentiam magistrî et sociorum*."

While Mrs. Parker lived, the archbishop's family is re-

\* Bequest. Coll., August 27, 1618.

CHAP.  
XVI.Matthew  
Parker.

1559-75.

presented to us as a united happy family. When his sons married, although, with his usual wisdom, the archbishop provided them each with an independent home, yet they and their children found always a second home at Bekešbourne or at Lambeth.

But, alas! happiness in this world, except that which results from a soul in communion with its God and the holy ones of God, is brief.

The archbishop and Mrs. Parker had left Lambeth for Canterbury, rejoicing, we are told, to escape from the controversies which had disturbed the peace of the archbishop, and which had no doubt preyed upon the mind of his sympathizing wife. They had been delighted with the success which had attended their visit to Canterbury, and with the popularity, which, however short-lived, well conducted hospitality is sure to create. Parker was proud to show that the marriage of a prelate, so far from diminishing his usefulness, contributed to the esteem with which he was regarded by the gentry he entertained and the poor whom he fed.

Before she left Canterbury, however, Mrs. Parker experienced one of those strange forebodings which seem to predict an approaching end. Her spirits failed her; and in her depression she clung closer to the Saviour, whom she and her husband faithfully served, although from the Shibboleth of puritanism their good taste and the reality of their religion revolted.

Parker and his wife returned to Lambeth. Scarcely, however, had he settled to his studies, and passed to another phase of his archiepiscopal duties, when information was brought to him, that his wife had sickened with a feverish distemper, which—a kind of influenza—was then prevalent in Lambeth and throughout London. Her sickness increased. By her meek exhibition of Christian

Death  
of Mrs.  
Parker.

CHAP.  
XVI.Matthew  
Parker.

1559-75.

patience, and by the assurance, that as she had lived, so she was dying, in the sure and certain hope of a resurrection to eternal life through the merits and mercies of our Lord and only Saviour Jesus Christ, her husband was comforted. He hoped against hope; he prayed; but on the 17th day of August, 1570, Matthew Parker was a widower.

Parker was not a man of many words; but among his brief memorandums, to which we have had occasion sometimes to refer, he said,—expressing himself in Latin in two sentences brought together in juxtaposition: “A.D. 1547, 24th of June, I married Margaret, daughter of Robert Harleston, of Mattishall, in the county of Norfolk, gentleman, who was born A.D. 1519, Sunday letter B., on the 23rd of June, in which the festival of Corpus Christi fell on the eve of St. John Baptist.”

This is followed by an entry, dated 1570: “Thus Margaret, my most beloved and virtuous wife, lived with me some twenty-six years, and died right Christianly, on the 17th of August, 1570, and was buried in the Duke of Norfolk’s chapel in Lambeth.”

Mrs. Parker was buried, as is here stated, in the Duke of Norfolk’s chapel or dormitory, which is in the parish church of Lambeth. This became her property when, in conjunction with her husband, she purchased Norfolk House. Upon her tomb was engraven in letters of gold: *Qui credit in me non morietur in æternum.*

To her native parish of Mattishall, in Norfolk, she left the annual sum of fifty shillings, equivalent to about as much as fifty pounds in modern money; part to be given to the poor, part for an anniversary sermon, and a portion for the sustentation of a school: regard, it was observed, was thus had to all classes of people in the town,—to the poor, to the youth, to the parishioners generally.



Another family affliction Parker had to endure, when in the month of December, 1574, he followed to the grave his second son, Matthew, who died at the age of twenty-three. He died at the Duke's house, Lambeth, which had been assigned to him by his father as a residence after the death of the archbishop's wife. He must have been dependent upon his father for his income; for his wife, the daughter of Barlow, Bishop of Chichester, brought with her no portion, or next to none. All that she received from first to last from her father was 100*l.*, or rather what would have been valued at that sum, if all had been properly appraised;—besides a gelding, she had for her apparel 10*l.*, a stock of damask linen worth 12*l.*, a tablecloth and a towel, two pillow-biers, two long cushions, a silver salt, and standing cup, and 10*l.* in money.\*

The archbishop sought in the discharge of the routine duties of his office, and in his literary pursuits, that employment which he knew to conduce to his spiritual and intellectual health; and he felt also that time would, under the direction of God the Holy Ghost, be a consoler—not in the way of dulling the memory, but as shortening, day by day, the dreariness of separation, and bringing him nearer to the point where, among brighter hopes, that of re-union will shed its ray of cheerfulness. We hear not of any neglect of duty on the part of Parker; nevertheless it was not till the year 1573, that he was able to take pleasure in the discharge of his episcopal functions. Doubtless, in his solitary moments he was still a heartbroken man; but he was now awakened to energetic employment by hearing that the queen would enable him, by giving a feast to her majesty, to do what she had prevented him from doing when he first visited Canterbury after his consecration.

CHAP.  
XVI.

Matthew  
Parker.

1559-75.

Death of  
Matthew  
Parker the  
younger.

\* MS. John Parker.



CHAP.  
XVI.

Matthew  
Parker.

1559-75.

Queen's  
visit to  
Lambeth.

Previously to her progress in Kent, the queen at the beginning of the year had visited the primate. It was a short visit. She had kept her Christmas at Hampton Court, and remained there till Lent. She arrived at Lambeth on Tuesday, the 2nd of March. The next day, being Wednesday in Lent, the archbishop prepared for the entertainment of the queen, by causing a pulpit to be erected in the quadrangle near the pump. Here, as was usual on the Wednesdays in Lent, a sermon was delivered; the preacher on this occasion was Dr. Pearse. The queen heard the sermon from an upper gallery looking towards the Thames.\* The nobility and courtiers stood in the other galleries, which formed the quadrangle. The people from below were said to divide their attention between her majesty and the preacher.† When the sermon was over, the royal party separated for dinner. The archbishop received his own guests in an apartment next to the garden below stairs. The rest of the house was occupied by the queen and her attendants. On the preceding Tuesday, he had invited a large party of "the inferior courtiers," as they were termed. On the Wednesday, in the room just mentioned, he made "a great dinner." At his own table sat nine earls and seven barons. At the other table sat the controller of the queen's household, her secretary, and many other knights and esquires. A table was prepared for the great officers of state; at this table sat the lord treasurer, the lord high admiral, the chamberlain, and other noblemen. In the *Matthæus* it is carefully noted, that the whole expense was borne by the archbishop.

\* Nichols observes, that these galleries appear to be the same which now form the library; and he observes, that in his time, 1823, there was still a pump in the quadrangle below.

† The account in Nichols is little more than a translation of the *Matthæus*, from which I have taken the account.

At four o'clock on Wednesday afternoon the queen and her court removed to her palace at Greenwich, where, on the 19th of March, the order of the Maundy was observed. It may be remarked, that this differed little from the ceremonial in Queen Mary's reign, which has been described in the life of Pole, and no further description of the observances can be required.

CHAP.  
XVI.  
Matthew  
Parker.  
1559-75.  
The  
queen's  
Maundy.

On Wednesday, the 14th of July, Queen Elizabeth visited the archbishop again at his house at Croydon. There she remained with all her attendants for seven days. So well pleased was she with her entertainment on this occasion, that she designed to repeat her visit the following year; at least, from an original paper, dated 1574, preparations seem to have been made for her reception,\* although it is not certain that her intentions were fulfilled.

Queen's  
visit to  
Croydon.

It was at the close of this year that the archbishop entertained the queen in almost regal splendour at Canterbury.† The archbishop was indefatigable in the preparations he made for the reception of her majesty. He thought not only of the conveniences of life; he prepared for her intellectual pleasures, and encouraged the people to make such a demonstration of loyalty as was always evinced towards the great queen by her contemporaries and by her loving subjects. If she was severe, capricious, and jealous in her treatment of her nobles, the commons knew that their welfare was dear to the queen's heart, and a patriot sovereign is sure to reign over loyal subjects. Parker knew how inquisitive Elizabeth was in all that related to the history of the places at which she at any time sojourned, and in all that related to archæology—his own

Prepara-  
tions for  
the queen's  
reception  
in Kent.

\* Ducarel's Croydon, p. 36.

† Of Parker's magnificent reception of the queen at Canterbury, an account may be gleaned from the Correspondence, the Matthæus, and the authorities cited in Nichols' Progresses.

CHAP.  
XVI.  
Matthew  
Parker.  
1559-75.

favourite study. Elizabeth had the royal faculty of being able to put questions, so as to gain through the ear, that information which most people obtain through the eye.

That Cecil might be able to answer all inquiries, Parker sent him "Lambarde's Topographical Discourse of Kent" in manuscript. The archbishop was able to provide the treasurer also with a copy of the author's intended preface to his book. He sent him, moreover, a discourse on Dover. The author of this treatise being unknown, Parker did not commit himself to all his statements; he merely observed, "that he would rather be too busy than too slow in participating his trifles."\* Cecil found many errors in the work, which the archbishop caused to be corrected; and he then returned it with an extract from an ancient manuscript, "De Wardâ Castri."

Parker took up his residence at Bekesbourne; from which place he could easily repair to Canterbury, only three miles off. Here he laid in his stock of wine, of beer, and other provisions. In spite of the delicate state of his health, he was indefatigable in his exertions. It was, indeed, a labour of love.

Queen's  
progress  
delayed.

In the midst of these exertions, a notice came from Lord Cobham, the lord-lieutenant of Kent, that the measles and small-pox were prevalent at Canterbury, and that the plague had made its appearance at Sandwich. This, of course, put a stop for the present, to all proceedings. Writing to the lord treasurer, Parker told him that, for fifteen years, it had been the joy of his heart to anticipate a visit, in his cathedral city, from the queen; he cared not for the cost, so that he might secure the

\* William Darrel, chaplain to the queen, quoted by Camden in his *Britannia*, is supposed to have been the author.

honour, and make manifest his gratitude, love, and loyalty. The disappointment, therefore, was very great when the delay was announced; but, anxious as he was to see her majesty in his house at Canterbury, he would not have her person exposed to danger.

Whether the report was exaggerated or not, the visit was only for a short time delayed, and at the latter end of the month the queen started on her progress. The weather proved cold and wet; but the queen, undaunted, would not disappoint her subjects, who were longing to express, and, in expressing, to increase, the affections which, as we have said, bound a loyal people to a patriot queen.

His grace the archbishop was characteristically employed at Bekesbourne, in searching for precedents, that he might ascertain how his predecessors had acted when entertaining the princes they served. In writing to the lord treasurer, he entreated him to give him his advice, for he had no other counsel to follow, but such as resulted from his antiquarian researches; and he added that, in these researches, he was "sore let and hindered by his oft distemperance and infirmity of body which prevented his doing as much as he wished."

He informed the treasurer, that if her majesty would be pleased to remain in his house, he could provide her with the conveniences of his own apartments. If she determined, however, to go to St. Augustine's, now converted into a royal palace, he was willing to receive his lordship, together with the Earl of Sussex, who was lord chamberlain; the master of the horse, Christopher Hatton; and the Earl of Leicester. His invitation to the latter nobleman was like an offer of reconciliation after their late misunderstandings. It sounds strange to modern ears, that he simply offered them accommodation in the

CHAP.  
XVI.

Matthew  
Parker.

1559-75.



CHAP.  
XVI.

Matthew  
Parker.

1559-75.

way of apartments, requiring them to provide the furniture—"their own stuff." If her majesty's residence at St. Augustine's should render a residence in Canterbury necessary to the lords of her court, he then reminded them, that their lordships could be accommodated at the deanery, or in some of the prebendal houses. He added, by way of pleasantry, that for the honour of entertaining Cecil himself there was a kind of scramble. He sent a programme of the proceedings, which, without dictating to her highness, he ventured to lay before her, as showing what was his own opinion in regard to the arrangements to be made. He corresponded to the same purpose with the Earl of Sussex and other courtiers. It was finally determined, that the queen should not go to Bekesbourne, but that she should take up her abode at St. Augustine's; which, on the dissolution of the monasteries, had been appropriated to his own use by her father. Thence she was to proceed, on her birthday, to partake of the hospitality of the archbishop in that great hall, which, after having witnessed, for centuries, the homage of the Church to the State, has since become a mass of ruins.

Towards the close of his life, when it was reported the queen was about to make a progress in the north of England, Archbishop Parker narrated the proceedings of this royal reception to Archbishop Grindal. Of the letter he then wrote the Archbishop of York remarked, "Your grace's large description of the entertainment at Canterbury did so lively set forth the matter that, in reading thereof, I almost thought myself one of your guests there."

When the information arrived, that the queen was approaching Kent, the archbishop, with Lord Cobham, commander of the seaports, and a large company of their retainers, proceeded to Folkestone Down—there to receive

her majesty. They found assembled on the down between three and four hundred knights and gentlemen of the county, in squadrons on horseback. The queen was on her way to Dover, and they formed an escort. As she approached Dover, late in the evening, the air resounded with the thunder of the guns from the castle and from the ships in the harbour. She was accompanied into the town by the mayor and the jurats, together with three or four hundred soldiers. This was on the 25th of August, and she remained at Dover for six days. The queen, like her father, took a great interest in all that pertained to the English navy, and her time was fully occupied with her ministers and various officers of state; the archbishop, therefore, returned to Canterbury on the 26th of August.

On the 3rd of September, the queen, who had dined at Wingham, reached Canterbury at about three o'clock in the afternoon. She immediately repaired to the cathedral. Before she dismounted from her horse, however, the grammarian, as the head boy of the grammar school was called, stood forward from among his school-fellows, and, according to custom, addressed to her an oration in Latin. This kind of ceremony was always acceptable to Elizabeth; it was an encouragement of learning, and gave her an opportunity for showing her own Latinity, of which she was justly proud.

She alighted from her horse. The great west door of the cathedral was thrown open—that door which, as we have seen, was only opened to the sovereign of the country, or the metropolitan of the province, when coming in royal or pontifical state—and here, waiting to receive her, she saw the Archbishop of Canterbury, with the Bishops of London and Rochester and the Lord Suffragan of Dover, appareled, as it is expressly

CHAP.  
XVI.

Matthew  
Parker.

1559-75.

Queen addressed by  
the grammarian.

The queen  
in the  
cathedral.

CHAP.  
XVI.Matthew  
Parker.

1559-75.

stated, in their chimeres and rochets.\* She entered, and, all kneeling, the Deus Misereatur was chanted in English.

The choir, with the dean and prebendaries, who had been arranged on either side of the cathedral, then united, and "brought her majesty with *square-song*" through the nave into the choir, the queen walking, under a canopy borne by four knights, to the traverse† which was raised at the east end of the church. Here she heard even-song. When even-song was concluded, the queen, under the canopy, and supported as before, proceeded, through the close, to the archbishop's oratory.

As soon as the necessary preparations had been made, she reappeared before the expectant multitude; and, amidst the cheers of the people, through the crowded streets she walked in state to St. Augustine's.

On the following Sunday the queen again went to the cathedral, passing through the streets in a carriage. On that day the dean preached. The archbishop, having attended the queen's majesty to her palace, returned to

\* According to Mr. Orby Shipley, in his useful "Glossary of Ecclesiastical Terms," the title of chimere was first given by Archbishop Parker, to the cope of black silk, now worn with the sleeves of the rochet sewn to it. He does not give his authority. It was probably the D.D.'s scarlet sleeveless habit worn by bishops in the reign of Henry VIII. and Edward VI. Owing to the objections of the fanatical Bishop Hooper, the colour was changed from red to black, and this change, without authority, has prevailed, except when bishops meet in Convocation. The rochet is a peculiar kind of alb. The wide sleeves attached to the chimere, and worn by Anglican bishops, are an innovation on the ancient vestment.

† The word "traverse" has been used two or three times in this chapter; and as the word is not now in common use, the reader may like to know that it signifies a canopied chair of state, placed at the upper end of the choir in a royal chapel or cathedral, for the use of the sovereign.

his own house, and there he gave a splendid entertainment to members of the privy council and other courtiers. "I gave them," he says, "fourteen or fifteen dishes, furnished with two messes, at my long table, whereat sat about twenty. In the same chamber a third mess, and a separate table, at which sat ten or twelve guests; my less hall having three long tables, well furnished with my officers and with the guard and with others of the court."

CHAP.  
XVI.

Matthew  
Parker.

1559-75.

Dinner  
to the  
courtiers.

On the 7th of September, the queen's birthday, and at the very hour, it was said, of her attaining her fortieth year, the archbishop welcomed to his palace the queen he loved so truly and had served so faithfully. There was immediately some ceremonial observance; the queen proceeded to wash her hands, and was waited upon by the nobility then present. She afterwards was escorted by the archbishop and the nobles present to the hall. At the centre of the table she took her place, when dinner was served, and the queen was waited upon by the gentlemen of her household. Her seat was a marble chair, which her ancestors from generation to generation had been accustomed to occupy, and which was now adorned with gilded trappings; and over her was a canopy "glittering with gold."

Dinner to  
the queen.  
7th Sept.

The place of honour, next to the queen, was, by the courtesy of England, assigned to the Count de Retz, who, with a hundred gentlemen in his train, and associated with the Sire de la Motte, had arrived at Canterbury, an ambassador from the King of France to the Queen of England. They were so placed as to ace her majesty, and could thus hold conversation with her "the more conveniently and familiarly." \*

\* Marshal de Retz and Monsieur de la Motte are both mentioned in the "Calendar of State Papers."



CHAP.  
XVI.Matthew  
Parker.

1559-75.

On the queen's left hand, at the end of the table, sat four illustrious ladies—the Marchioness of Northampton, the Countess of Oxford, the Countess of Lincoln, and the Countess of Warwick. These ladies and the French ambassador were waited upon by the royal attendants called pensioners. At the table on the right, nearest the queen, but not at the queen's own table, sat with the archbishop, the privy councillors, together with certain noblemen and illustrious ladies, and among these the most eminent of the ladies who came from France with De Retz. On the left of the queen sat certain noble and illustrious ladies of her own court. At the further end of the hall were the Mayor of Canterbury and the more distinguished citizens, together with the county gentlemen and their ladies. All these were waited upon by the archbishop's servants.

Such was the anxiety of the people to see the queen, and such the desire of the archbishop to meet the people's wishes, that the centre of the hall soon became inconveniently crowded by unbidden visitors. They came as spectators of the splendour; and everyone knew that he had only to "bide his time," and, if his appetite was excited by "the sights and smells" which regaled his senses without satisfying his appetite, he would, as soon as the first guests had departed, be welcomed by the archbishop's attendants to partake of his hospitality. It was his grace's express command to his servants, that all strangers should be received and treated with all manner of civility and respect. He himself mixed with the crowd, and encouraged cheerfulness, though he appointed a monitor of the hall to prevent brawling and loud talking.

Some confusion ensuing, the queen, as she was accustomed, took the discipline into her own hands. While the first guests were served, the hall was inconveniently crowded, she gave directions for the intruders to be

arranged at the sides of the hall ; so that the length of that splendid apartment, as well as the guests who occupied the tables, might be seen by the foreigners, and by those of her own people, who had come to assist the archbishop in giving a hearty loyal reception to their beloved sovereign.

At the conclusion of the banquet, the queen held a private conversation with the Marshal de Retz and the Sire de la Motte. Meanwhile the tables were removed ; the music sounded, and the nobles and their ladies joined in the dance.

The queen did not dance or remain long in the ball-room. Matters of State occupied her mind, and she went up by a secret passage to the archbishop's gallery. There she prolonged her conference with the ambassador ; until she was warned, by the approach of night, that it was time for her to return to St. Augustine's.

Before she took her departure she turned to the archbishop, and, in the presence of her court and of the foreigners, with that graciousness which, whenever she chose to assume it, was irresistible, she told his grace that the entertainment of that day had been peculiarly gratifying to her, while, in the display of his loyalty, munificence, and good taste, it reflected much to the honour of the archbishop himself. His grace conducted her to her carriage. Before she entered it she renewed her thanks. The streets were still crowded, and, as she made her appearance, they resounded with one joyful loyal shout. Such a shout was always like music to Elizabeth's ear ; she smiled her thanks as she passed, and returned in high spirits to her palace.

The archbishop knew, that more than a splendid entertainment was expected by those upon whom the queen conferred the expensive honour of a visit ; and he had pre-

CHAP.  
XVI.

Matthew  
Parker.

1559-75.

CHAP.  
XVI.Matthew  
Parker.

1559-75.

Presents  
to the  
queen and  
her nobles.

pared, and now presented to the queen, some remarkable gifts—viz. a salt-cellar wrought in gold and its cover an agate; on it was represented St. George slaying the dragon, with French verses around the royal arms. On the concave part was another gem, an agate, on which was cut an exact portrait of the queen herself. On the top of the cover a golden ship contained an oblong diamond. This salt-cellar,\* containing six Portugal pieces of gold, each of which was of the value of three pounds ten shillings English, the archbishop presented to the queen. It was valued at more than 200 English marks. Besides this a beautiful horse, which, when the archbishop, with his retinue, met the queen on Folkestone Mount, she looked at and admired above all the other horses in the cavalcade, the primate gave her. This horse surpassed all others belonging to the queen's nobles and attendants. To each of the nobles and illustrious men in the hall he presented a Latin book recently edited (*De Visibili Romanarchia*), against Nicholas Sanders' *Monarchia*; and to every illustrious lady a copy of *Commentaries on Ecclesiastes*, done into English, and a smaller English Bible exquisitely and ornamentally bound. Finally, he distributed among the attendants more than fifty pieces of gold.

During the whole time that the queen stayed at Canterbury, the archbishop continued to keep open house for strangers as well as guests. In the great chamber were three different ranks of guests. Different kinds of diet were set for nobles, councillors, and illustrious persons. Two of the three were at the archbishop's table, and the third at another table. The lesser hall was devoted every

\* It is thus described in an inventory (Nichols, i. 378): "Onne sault of agth, garnished with golde, with a cover having in the top a gallie, in the middle thereof is a lozenged diamond, given by Archbishop of Canterburie, in progress, anno præd. (1573)."

day to the dinner entertainments and earlier repasts of the attendants, who would have afterwards to serve their masters.

CHAP.  
XVI.

Matthew  
Parker.

1559-75.

After the queen's departure the archbishop lingered for a time to complete his visitation of the cathedral, and to make preparations for a visitation of the diocese.

Parker returned to his solitary home at Lambeth. The house, indeed, was filled. But it appeared like a wilderness to him, when *she* was absent for whose sympathy he had ever been accustomed to look, and never to look in vain; and who, from a knowledge of his heart, in its weakness and in its strength, was the only person with whom he could converse in the full assurance of being understood. Amid the many he was desolate. He had reached the zenith, not of his happiness, but of his glory, when he had entertained all that England held of noble and renowned at his palace in Canterbury; and had received the thanks of his much-loved queen. We can imagine the reaction, and we see its nature in the fact that he had now become querulous. He had always been more or less of an invalid; latterly his sufferings had become sometimes most acute; and by bodily pain mental anguish is often revived, and irritability of temper follows. His enemies seemed to have multiplied around him; as he grew weaker they became more bold, and, in his inability to resist opponents, he thought himself forsaken by his friends. He complained of the bishops, that when he sought their assistance, they exhibited more fear of the malignity of the Puritans, than gratitude to him, to whom most of them were indebted for their high station in the Church. In writing to Burghley, he lamented his incapacity to serve God and his Church as he desired to do. Single-handed and unaided, he was unable to bring to a successful termination that reformation of the Church

Parker's  
increased  
ill-health.



CHAP.  
XVI.

Matthew  
Parker.

1559-75.

to which he had devoted his life. He found employment in his literary pursuits—the object of those pursuits being to provide for his successors, principles and precedents for continuing and completing the Reformation, of which he regarded what had been hitherto accomplished only in the light of a commencement. “I have,” he said, “very little help, if ye knew all, where I thought to have much; and thus, until Almighty God comes, I repose myself in patience.”\*

His com-  
plaints.

He felt aggrieved at the attempts to undermine him at court; and expresses his fears that the queen’s safety, through the machinations of the Precisians and Anabaptists, would be endangered. Touching the safety of the queen, he even condescended to be alarmed at some old wives’ fables and prophecies.

I throw all these things together, for I think that they show that, whatever of truth there may have been in these complaints of the aged primate, they were exaggerated and discoloured by the waning powers and the incessant sufferings of the patient; whose vigour of mind, nevertheless, when he was compelled to exert himself, remained till the last.

That Matthew Parker had many enemies, and that those enemies, forgetting who is the accuser of the brethren, fabricated falsehoods to blacken his character, and to alienate the queen’s affections from her loyal and loving friend, is only to say, that Parker was a great man. What great and good man ever existed whose footsteps were not dogged by our great enemy? How can the disciples of a crucified Master expect to escape persecution? A woe is pronounced upon those of whom *all* speak well; and we are not to forget, that if Parker’s enemies were many, his friends were numerous and were

\* Corresp. p. 474.

found among the excellent of the earth. We need only mention his chaplains and clerical friends, such as Gheast and Jewel, both Bishops of Salisbury, Robinson Bishop of Bangor, Curtis and Bickly Bishops of Chichester, Still Bishop of Bath and Wells, John Man Warden of Merton College Oxford, and Scambler Bishop of Norwich. In the line of general literature, of philosophy and of political science, where could we find men superior to that wisest of ministers, Sir William Cecil—a name dear to many hearts—Lord Keeper Bacon, Sir John Cheke, Whitgift (destined after a time to occupy the episcopal throne of Canterbury), Robert Talbot, John Owen (physician to Henry VIII.), Martin Bucer, William Lambarde, John Stow, Walter Haddon, Dr. Ackworth, Sir Thomas Smith, and the archbishop's secretaries, John Josceline and Alexander Neville?

CHAP.  
XVI.

Matthew  
Parker.

1559-75.

Parker's  
contempo-  
raries.

Some of these had passed into the Church triumphant before Matthew Parker; but at some period of his life, with more or less intimacy, these were his friends; and from experience he knew the value of the saying: "*amicus certus in re incertâ cernitur.*"

Notwithstanding his increasing sufferings, Parker, to the last, attended to business; and, by so doing, checked the disorders of a morbid mind. His last letter to Burghley was on the 11th of April; it was chiefly intended to meet the queen's eyes, to warn her against the Puritans and Anabaptists. On the 1st of May, 1575, he issued a commission to Dr. Barr, clerk official of the Court of Arches, for admitting proctors into his court. This was his last public act. He was now preparing for the last scene in his eventful life.

Dictated,  
for he was  
too weak  
to write,  
his last  
public act.

Parker had already, like so many of his predecessors, prepared his tomb. It was of black marble; and he was accustomed, in his meditative moments, to solemnize

His tomb  
prepared.

CHAP.  
XVI.Matthew  
Parker.

1559-75.

his thoughts, and to prepare his mind for meditation, by gazing on the stone receptacle in which his corpse was soon to be laid. His will was carefully considered, and is dated the 5th of April, 1575. The signature gives proof that, although his mind retained its vigour when the will was dictated, he was nevertheless in agonies of pain when it was signed. "I profess," he says, "that I do certainly believe whatsoever the Holy Catholic Church believeth and receiveth in any articles whatsoever pertaining to faith, hope, and charity; and where in these I have offended my Lord God in any ways, either by imprudence, or will, or weakness, I repent from my heart of my fault and error, and I ask forgiveness with a contrite heart; which remission and indulgence I do most firmly hold I shall obtain by the precious death and merits of my most indulgent Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ. By whose singular grace I hope also to be made partaker of eternal joy of body and soul, in that day wherein all shall rise again with their bodies to the last judgment. Therefore to this Jesus Christ, together with the Father and the Holy Ghost, be all honour and thanksgiving, both now and to all eternity. AMEN."

His soul he bequeathed and commended into the hands of God the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost; and his "body to the earth to be buried, or any other way to be handled, as Almighty God had determined the hour, manner, and place of dying according to his good pleasure."

Besides those charitable donations, already noticed, he gave to his successors his choral organ in the chapel at Lambeth, and all his arms and implements of war, with their appurtenances, in his armouries at Canterbury and Lambeth, together with the saddles of his war-horses; also "*illum magnum instrumentum musicum, quasi abacum, cum suis appendicis, jam locatum in*

*cubiculo illo quod ministri regii vocant presentia,*" together with the pictures of Archbishop Warham and of Erasmus. He also gave to Edmund Grindal, Archbishop of York, a gold ring with a round sapphire; to Edwin Sandys, Bishop of London, his staff of Indian cane with silver gilt at the end; to Robert Horn, Bishop of Winchester, a gold ring with a turquoise; to Richard Cox, Bishop of Ely, his staff of Indian cane with a horologe on the top; to Nicholas Bullingham, Bishop of Worcester, his white horse, called Hackington, with the saddle and bridle and a new foot-cloth of velvet; to Andrew Pearson, B.D., a silver cup with a cover gilt, given to him by the queen on the feast of the Circumcision; to the Lord Keeper Bacon, a great gilt cup, with the cover, weighing forty-three ounces, and a psalter with a Saxon gloss, fairly written and bound; to Lord Burghley, his best gold ring, with a sapphire cut in squares, and a cup of ivory; to Sir William Cordel, Master of the Rolls, his gilt cup with a cover, given to him by the queen, January 1, 1572.

There were also pecuniary and other bequests to friends of less importance, which need not be particularized. The inventory of his goods, household stuff, plate, &c., taken May 31, 1575, is curious and interesting, especially the list of his pictures and maps.

In the intervals of suffering, Parker sought consolation, not only in the offices of devotion, but also in the exercise of his intellectual powers: it was between the paroxysms of an acute disease that he dictated that letter to the Archbishop of York, of which much use has just been made in our description of the queen's progress in Kent. The vigour and vivacity displayed in that letter excited the admiration of Archbishop Grindal, and it is a remarkable production, as showing the strength of his will in the control of his powers, when we should have thought them para-

CHAP.  
XVI.

Matthew  
Parker.  
1559-75.



CHAP.  
XVI.

Matthew  
Parker.

1559-75.

lyzed. The letter is dated the 17th of March, and evinces more freedom and elasticity of mind than is usually displayed in the letters of that age. Letter-writing at that period had not become a branch of literature, and few epistles were despatched except those that related to business. We find from the *Registrum Sacrum*, that the archbishop, only a month before his death, exerted himself to consecrate William Blethin to the see of Llandaff.

Parker's friend and faithful secretary, Alexander Neville, watched at the sick-bed with filial devotion; and bears testimony to the vigour of the primate's mind and the accuracy of his memory to the last. The inevitable hour at length arrived; and on the 17th of May, 1575, Matthew Parker breathed his last: "*integris sensibus*," says his chaplain, "*ætate optimâ, e vitâ, tanquam e scenâ bene peractæ fabulæ discessit*." The funeral took place on the 6th of June. In a paper, superscribed by the lord treasurer, an account is preserved of the persons by whom the funeral was attended. The attendance, even if it had been composed only of the members of his own household, would have been large; and the number was increased by the private friends of the late primate who desired to show their affection; and by many persons holding high offices in the state, whose wish it was to evince their respect. The garter and clarenceux kings-at-arms attended, with four heralds and two pursuivants. Besides many bishops and deans, the two chief justices and two puisne judges, the Master of the Rolls, the Recorder of London, and the lawyers practising in the Court of Arches, appeared among the mourners. It is remarkable, that none of the kindred of the late archbishop are mentioned as bearing part in the ceremonial; the Bishop of London, as the representative of the clergy of the province, acted as chief mourner. We may presume that the relatives were pre-

sent, but in a private capacity ; a regulation, in regard to a public funeral, wisely made. The sermon was preached by the Bishop of Lincoln.

CHAP.  
XVI.

Matthew  
Parker.

1559-75.

The proceedings previously arranged by Parker were highly characteristic. Wishing to maintain "the port of a bishop" to the last, he was desirous that due honour should be paid to the primate of all England. He would not permit his private feelings to interfere with that public mark of respect which was due to one who had been for many years the head of the Church ; and he was buried in the chapel within the palace, at the upper end near the altar, where he had been accustomed to pray. But, thinking of his beloved wife to the last, he could not bear the thought, that they who had been one in life, and whose joint prayer it had often been, that they might be united in eternity—should be separated even in the grave. He had expressed a wish, and the wish was regarded by the survivors as a command, that, when his body was laid out, his bowels should be placed in an urn, and be laid on the coffin of his wife in the Duke's chapel in Lambeth Church.

He not only, like many of his predecessors, made his tomb, but during his lifetime he also caused his monument to be erected, with the following inscription :

Depositum Reverendissimi in Christo patris, Matthæi Parkeri, Archiepiscopi Cantuar. Sedit annos 15 menses 6 ; obiit 1575, Maii 17.

Some verses had been composed by the archbishop's dear friend, Dr. Walter Haddon ; and they had been carefully preserved by Parker, though he refused to publish them, being too modest to accept what he thought too favourable a description of his character. He nevertheless read the verses occasionally, that he might be incited to acquire the qualities and virtues which the

CHAP.  
XVI.Matthew  
Parker.  
1559-75.

partiality of friendship had ascribed to him. These verses the executors now affixed to the monument.

Sobrius et prudens, studiis excultus et usu,  
Integer, et veræ religionis amans;  
Matthæus vixit Parkerus. Foverat illum  
Aula virum juvenem, fovit et aula senem.  
Ordine res gessit, Recti defensor et Æqui;  
Vixerat ille Deo, mortuus ille Deo est.  
Anno Domini 1575, Ætatis suæ 71.

Puritan in-  
tolerance.

The Puritans, who had hated Parker while living, pursued him by their malignity even to death, and long after death. A treatment similar to that which his friend Bucer had experienced from the Papists, as distinguished from the Catholics, Parker himself underwent at the hands of Puritans, as distinguished from Protestants.

Neither stone, nor epitaph, nor monument, as they originally stood, any longer remain; for, in the reign of Charles I., not only was the monument demolished by the Puritans, but, with a zeal without charity, the body of the old man was dug up, the lead was plucked off the coffin and was sold; the bones were buried, not in a church or churchyard, but in a dunghill. There they remained until the restoration of Charles II. At that time, the celebrated antiquary, Sir William Dugdale, hearing by chance of the transaction, mentioned the circumstance to Archbishop Sancroft. By Sancroft an order was obtained from the House of Lords, and search being made, the bones were recovered, and the body was decently reinterred in the chapel, though not in the same part of it as before. Over the remains was this inscription: *Corpus Matthæi Archiepiscopi hic tandem quiescit.*

Archbishop Sancroft caused a monument to be erected in the vestibule of the chapel to his illustrious prede-

cessor. The following epitaph is attributed to the pen of his grace :—

CHAP.  
XVI.

Matthew  
Parker.  
1559-75.

Matthæi Archiepiscopi Cenotaphium.

Corpus enim (ne nescius lector)

In adyto hujus sacelli olim rite conditum,

A sectariis perduellibus anno MDCXLVIII.

Effracto sacrilegè hoc ipso tumulo,

Elogio sepulchrali impie refixo,

Direptis nefariè exuviis plumbeis,

Spoliatum, violatum, eliminatum ;

Etiam sub sterquilinio, (proh ! Scelus) abstrusum :

Rege demum (plaudente cœlo et terra) redeunte

Ex decreto Baronum Angliæ sedulo requisitum,

Et sacello postliminio redditum,

Et ejus quasi medio tandem quiescit.

Et quiescat utinam

Nonnisi tuba ultima sollicitandum.

QUI DENUO DESECAVERIT, SACER ESTO.

Besides several portraits of Parker said to exist at Corpus Christi College, Cambridge, there are likenesses of him at Trinity College in that University, at Lambeth Palace, and in the Guildhall of Norwich. These have been engraved by R. Hogenbergh, R. White, P. a Gunst, Vertue, Michael Tyson, C. Picart, and J. Fittler, as also in the *Heroologia*.

As in the biographies of his predecessors in the see of Canterbury, so also in the life of Parker, not only the more prominent and important historical facts have been impressed upon the reader's mind, but certain minute details have been also advanced from more recondite documents, to enable each reader to form his own estimate of the several archbishops as they have passed in review before him. But, in the case of Matthew Parker, his character has been systematically traduced and misrepresented by a long succession of impassioned Puritan writers.



CHAP.  
XVI.

Matthew  
Parker.

1559-75.

Among the historians who have undertaken to write the history of England, it unfortunately happens that some of the most popular are hostile to the Christian religion, and in particular to the Church of England. The unexamined and unquestioned statements of the Puritan writers have too often been taken by these authors as an authority; and without any reference to original documents, their misrepresentations have been repeated, until certain falsehoods at length have been taken for granted and stereotyped for the use of historians who affect to regard ecclesiastical affairs as unworthy of particular notice. They are especially bitter against a primate, to whom, in conjunction with Cecil and Queen Elizabeth, we are indebted, under God's providence, in a revolutionary age, for the preservation of the Church in England, if not intact, yet unassailable in all its vital and fundamental principles. To Parker's life I shall therefore append the testimony of two of our ecclesiastical historians, who have thoroughly investigated the original documents of the period; and who, belonging to different schools of thought, may be regarded as unprejudiced persons.

"Parker closed," says Mr. Soames, "a laborious and upright life, with all the foresight, firmness, and complacency, that marked a vigorous, equable, and religious mind. A natural gravity had kept him, even in youth, from spectacles, games, and field-sports. His memory was naturally odious to the Puritans, and has ever been roughly treated by dissenters. But Parker was really, in private, strictly moral, accessible, liberal, and methodical. As a public man, plain good sense, command of tongue and temper, laborious diligence, cautious decision, depth of penetration, and unity of purpose, appear to have been his characteristics. He had, as we have already seen, neither any superstitious reverence for the externals that

he enforced, nor much tenderness for scruples that could make such things important. He thought merely of the law, and of the ancient prejudices that rendered it expedient. He was no forward, nor even unreluctant volunteer in entering upon its rigorous execution, but that painful duty having been forced upon him by his superiors, he discharged it steadily to the end of life. Many men, undoubtedly, would have slackened in an irksome course, when sometimes deserted, sometimes thwarted, by the very power that had urged them into it. Parker contented himself with complaining of a tortuous policy, that he felt personally unjust and harassing, that was uncongenial to his plain blunt nature, and revolting to his principles. He well knew, besides, that Elizabeth, although seemingly vacillating herself, would bear no vacillation in him. Nor would a scholar's eye allow him either to doubt the propriety of her determination, or its ultimate success. Having none of the politician's pliancy, his discretion, learning, and integrity failed of securing all their proper weight among contemporaries. The same cause has widely operated to the prejudice of his memory upon posterity."\*

Archdeacon Hardwicke, one of the most judicious, impartial, and learned of our ecclesiastical historians, says of Parker: "By nature and by education, by the ripeness of his judgment and the incorruptness of his private life, he had been eminently fitted for the task of ruling the Church of England through a stormy period of her history; and though seldom able to reduce the conflicting elements of thought and feeling into active harmony, the vessel he was called to pilot has been saved, almost entirely by his skill, from breaking on the rock of

CHAP.  
XVI.

Matthew  
Parker.

1559-75.

\* Soames' Elizabethan History, p. 246.

CHAP.  
XVI.Matthew  
Parker.

1559-75.

medieval superstitions, or else drifting away into the whirlpool of licentiousness and unbelief.”\*

In the narrative of Parker's life an advance has been made in the history of the reformation of the English Church; but, as the reader was reminded in the introductory chapter to this book, the Reformation was not completed, it was only in progress, till the year 1661; nor indeed was it even then brought to a conclusion. There was a pause in its progress, but we have lived to see the Reformation, which was begun in the sixteenth century, about to be resumed in the nineteenth.

In order that we may be prepared to form a right judgment of what has taken place subsequently to the episcopate of Parker, it may be expedient to take a rapid glance of that history which has been already presented to the reader's notice.

A colony of the kingdom of Christ—a branch of the one Holy Catholic and Apostolic Church—was founded in England through the zeal of a pious bishop of Rome, by the preaching of Augustine, and the liberality of King Ethelbert. This Church soon after languished and became inert, until it was resuscitated and reformed by the wisdom of Theodorus or Theodore of Tarsus.

We have seen the Church in close connection with the State, as the soul with the body of man. It acted as one great community, and laboured successfully in the civilization of our country until the time of the Norman Conquest. It was the policy of the Conqueror and of his immediate successors, not to dissolve the union between Church and State, but to make it more like the union between man and wife. Co-operation between the

\* Hardwicke's History of the Articles of Religion, p. 117. See also his History of the Reformation, p. 246.

two communities was desired, but there was to be independent action—one and the same verdict was sought, but from two independent courts; the ecclesiastical court and the king's court were to have co-ordinate jurisdiction, but different administrations.\* For a long period after this, we had to lament a gradual increase of corruptions, without an attempt to correct or even to investigate them. Prelates became statesmen; and the clergy mere lawyers. Worldliness gained possession of the Church, from the highest to the lowest of its members. Diocesans relegated their episcopal functions to bishops *in partibus*, in order that they might act as counsellors to their sovereigns, or as ambassadors in foreign parts. When men looked to the bishop of Rome to institute a reform, they found him engaged in a carnal warfare with the princes around him, for the purpose of establishing a temporal dominion; and he was, at one time, despised, and at another time, he became an object of envy to the powerful, whom he resisted, and of hatred to the weak, who looked to him in vain for protection.

In the fifteenth century, the demand for reform “from the head to the heel” became universal in Europe; and the great councils, convened to effect a correction of acknowledged abuses, only failed, because they did not go to the root of the evil; or perceive how corrupt conduct was to be traced to bad principles, to the rejection of unpalatable truths, and to the retention of lucrative falsehood.

In the sixteenth century, the corruptions became intoler-

CHAP.  
XVI.

Matthew  
Parker.

1559-75.

\* In Mr. Freeman's History of the Norman Conquest, the chapter on Ecclesiastical History is one of the most valuable. Theological knowledge is there united with historical accuracy; he is a philosopher as well as a divine, and certainly never “cooks” his statements to substantiate his conclusions. To that chapter the reader is referred, if he would investigate the ecclesiastical policy of the Normans.



CHAP.  
XVI.Matthew  
Parker.

1559-75.

able, and a mighty change took place. The circumstances of the court in this country rendered a demand for a reformation popular among the high and noble, as well as among all classes of the people; those only excepted whose worldly interests were identified with the pettifoggings of ecclesiastical speculation, or the excitements of worldly ambition.

The prevalent desire on the Continent was to destroy the Church, and on its ruins to erect a Protestant sect; though what sect was to be selected—this was a point on which controversialists could not agree; and are not agreed at the present time.

Even in England, as we have been careful to point out, a large party arose, acting on the same principle, and having the same object in view as the continental reformers—if the title of reformers must be given to those whose aim it was, not to reform but to revolutionize, not to edify but to supplant. For preventing the sectarians from effecting their purpose, Parker certainly deserves the gratitude of those who believe in the existence of one Holy Catholic and Apostolic Church, of which the Church of England is a branch.

When defeated in their immediate object, the Puritans pursued a more crafty course; they conformed to the Church with the secret determination of *sectarianizing* it. They treat it as a sect—one of the many sects existing in England, which has been established, although when, how, or by whom it was established, they would find it difficult to say.

By this party, now joined by freethinkers and Erastians, measures are adopted for resuming the work of the Reformation, suspended since the year 1661. Their opponents, acting discreetly, instead of opposing these measures, are prepared to treat them with due consideration, and, if

need be, to propose counter measures; but whatever course is pursued, vigilance as well as learning and wisdom are required. The question now before the Church, in her Convocations, differs widely from the questions which were discussed by the reformers of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. Our predecessors had to contend for the faith and for the retention of Catholic dogma; whereas the considerations offered to the notice of the present generation relate almost entirely to the expedient: How can we swell our numbers? How can we make the Church more popular? How can we persuade men to attend our services who repudiate or disregard our doctrines?

This seems to be simple enough—although now that the question is asked, it is found to be of less easy solution than at first appeared. The Puritan preacher refers to his eloquence in expounding a popular Calvinism; the latitudinarian dignitaries obtain hearers by the ability with which they make it manifest that the letter of the Bible may be read, though the whole spirit of the Gospel is evaded; the ritualist appeals with greater triumph to the crowds who flock to his services, the multitude who are grateful for his charities, and the sums for good works which swell his offertories.

This is not the time, nor does the occasion require, that we should seek the settlement of such differences as these; but it is, at all times, expedient to warn men, that these questions cannot long be discussed without involving us in doctrinal controversy. When the question is urged by worldly men, how are we to fill our churches, the further question must follow—it has already cropped up—whether it may not be expedient to sacrifice some portions of God's truth, in order that satisfaction may be given to that dogmatizing and intolerant ignorance, of

CHAP.  
XVI.

Matthew  
Parker.

1559-75.

CHAP.  
XVI.Matthew  
Parker.

1559-75.

which we have such abounding specimens in both Houses of Parliament.

We have need, therefore, to watch as well as to pray ; nay more, we must act with precaution and fear. Instead of encouraging the rash suggestions of the young and inexperienced, surely their attention should be called to the case of Uzzah :—when the ark of God was shaken by the oxen, he rashly “ put forth his hand and took hold of it—and the anger of the Lord was kindled against Uzzah, and God smote him there for his error.” \*

\* 2 Sam. vi. 6.

END OF THE NINTH VOLUME.






DATE DUE

~~SEP 30 '81~~



BW5295 .H78 v.9  
Lives of the archbishops of Canterbury.

Princeton Theological Seminary-Speer Library



1 1012 00017 8451